LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 12 1915
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX 8065 .S3613 1897
Schodde, George Henry, 1854-
1917,
The error of modern Missouri

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/errorofmodernmis00scho

NOV 10 1915

The Error of Modern Missouri:

ITS INCEPTION, DEVELOPMENT, AND REFUTATION,

As set forth in

I. The Present Controversy on Predestination: A Contribution to its History and Proper Estimate.

By F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,

Prof. of Theology in the Ev. Luth. Seminary, Columbus, Ohio; Author of Woerterbuch zum griechischen Neuen Testament; A Brief Commentary on the Books of the New Testament; Annotations on the Acts of the Apostles in the Lutheran Commentary.

II. "Intuitu Fidei."

By REV. F. A. SCHMIDT, D. D.,

Prof. in the Theological Seminary of the Norwegian United Church, Minneapolis, Minn.

III. A Testimony Against the False Doctrine of Predestination recently introduced by the Missouri Synod.

By SEVERAL FORMER MEMBERS OF THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

Translated from the German.

Edited by GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Ph. D.,
Prof. of Theology in the Ev. Luth. Seminary, Columbus, Ohio.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN
1897

INTRODUCTION.

IT is a matter of deep regret that the Synod of Missouri and other States has, for the past twenty years and more, set itself against the faith it at one time was the chief defender and promoter of in this country. Whether the membership of that body are aware of it or not, it is not for us to judge; but the fact remains that their doctrine of a particular yet unconditional election unto salvation subverts the entire system of Gospel truth and deprives every doctrinal member of that system of its saving power and comfort. Whilst the Lutheran Church in entire conformity with Scripture teaches but one decree unto salvation the Missourians teach, as coordinate to it, a second and one whereby the first is logically set aside and practically emptied of its gracious content. Professing to believe with us that God by His mercy would have all men to be saved, they at the same time contend for the doctrine that God has decreed to save only a few by giving to them—for reasons no man can know—the faith adequate to that end. Never were two articles of belief more glaringly contradictory offered for acceptance to the mind of man; and, as this last, never was doctrine so utterly destructive of every well-grounded hope of salvation.

The grave charge of heresy must stand against the synod of Missouri until it retracts. A mere correction of phrases cannot acquit that body; nor can it satisfy an offended church by any profession of belief in the universality of divine grace, however loud and unctious it may be in giving expression to it.

Its official utterances on the doctrine of predestination as ultimately set forth in the thirteen theses of 1881,* when considered apart from their history, might be allowed to pass; but taken in connection with the controversy that has called them forth they have settled nothing, except that the Missouri Synod as a body has adopted the position of its leading men and made

*See Minutes of the Delegate Synod of that year.

itself responsible for what they have written. The theses themselves fail to cover the all important point in dispute. When, for example, in thesis ten they declare that the faith foreseen by God in the elect is not the cause which moved Him to predestinate them unto salvation, they simply set up a man of straw, be it to knock him down or, which is more likely, to have the impression go abroad that their opponents had in all sincerity set up a figure of that description. But, what is more and worse: by the terms of its preamble to its declaration of faith the synod demands the latter to be subscribed to as the doctrine set forth in its publications up to that time, to wit, the *Lutheraner*, the *Lehre und Wehre*, and the Minutes of its several districts, notably that of the Western District.

In these publications the leaders and spokesmen of the body arraigned postulate a double grace in God: the one universal, being for all men alike; the other particular, specifically potent, and mysteriously intended for the elect few and bestowed on them alone. Strangely enough, the former alone never saves; whilst the latter, when concurrent to the first, shall and must save every man to whom for some reason unknown to us it is extended. By some eternal purpose and decree of God and without any regard on His part to anything whatsoever in man — the God-given faith included — this grace is extant for only the few God has ordained to salvation. Such, according to our Missouri opponents, is the grace of election.

When in 1881* Dr. Walther formulated anew the controverted points, the first proposition he declared himself ready to affirm and defend was, "that the faith foreseen by God flows from election;" or, in other words, that the persevering faith without which no sinner can be saved has its source in election. This proposition he set up over against the other, that election flows from the foreseen faith — an antithesis of his own invention; for what was really contended for — and is to-day — is the plain Bible truth that grace universal is for every man wholly and solely the source of the faith that can save him — a fact and truth our opponents have completely ignored! From the position thus assumed by the leader his followers have never receded; and to defend the pernicious doctrine then and there enunciated they stand in arms against us to this very day.

By the common consensus of Scripture teaching and of the

* See Lehre u. Wehre, Feb. '81, p. 54.

belief of all parties concerned as well as by the very word employed to designate it, *the grace of election is particular;* and this limited grace Missouri declares to be *the one source of effectually saving faith.* Aware of what such a doctrine implies, they ask men to forego the exercise of their prerogative to think and instead to adore the mystery divine they pretend to have discovered. Surely, poor mortals find mysteries enough in God's providential and gracious dealings with men to impress them with a due sense of His majesty; and to make souls stumble at mysteries which have no existence anywhere except in some people's imagination is a sin they will find it hard to account for.

To thinking men, led by the Word and Spirit of God, the Missouri doctrine of an unconditional election of a limited number of sinners unto conversion and persevering faith vitiates the whole plan of salvation. Unless a poor sinner knows himself to be one of God's elect—a matter he can have no certain and unmistakable knowledge of—his soul must be tossed with doubts and fears all his lifetime. Neither the mercy of God, nor the merits of Christ, nor the witnessing of the Spirit are able to give him rest; for—according to the Missourians—these do not suffice to save any man unless the mysterious grace of election be added to them; that is to say, unless God have in His eternal council irrevocably resolved that the man shall and must be saved!

Though a sort of truce seems to be observed at present by the parties to it, the controversy is not come to an end. It has been carried on for the most part by means of the German language; and whilst it has no doubt corrupted the faith of some and sorely afflicted the hearts of all who love the truth of God and desire His Church to prosper in peace, yet has the good Lord overruled the evil for good to thousands; for it cannot be denied that the battle has been the occasion of bringing to light many treasures of precious truth that might otherwise have remained hidden from the eyes of many who now rejoice in them. Bearing these facts in mind, President E. L. S. Tressel has rendered an invaluable service to the Church by publishing this volume, and thus making some of the choicest finds accessible to the English reading public.

The volume thus introduced presents three lengthy treatises on the subject of predestination. The first, by Dr. F. W. Stell-

horn and translated by Rev. R. C. H. Lenski, is a Contribution to the History and the proper Estimate of the recent controversy on the doctrine of Predestination. The Contribution covers three parts: the first, a dogmatic historical introduction to the subject; the second, the Formula of Concord and the old Lutheran theologians; and the third, the doctrine of predestination in the Missouri Synod.

The second treatise, *Intuitu Fidei*, is by Dr. F. A. Schmidt, and is translated by the brethren R. C. H. Lenski and C. B. Ghodes. In this the Rev. Doctor propounds and answers the three questions: first, What was the substantial content of the doctrine, that God made choice of the elect in foresight of faith, as taught by the fathers and teachers of the Lutheran Church? secondly, Did our fathers and teachers depart from the Confessions by teaching an election in foresight of faith? and thirdly, Is the doctrine of election in foresight of faith taught by the Lutheran Confession?

The third and last treatise is A Testimony Against the False Doctrine of Predestination Recently Introduced by the Missouri Synod, and an Appendix — by H. A. Allwardt — on the history of the controversy in that body. The first part of this paper contains a series of theses prepared by the brethren H. A. Allwardt and Prof. H. Ernst, followed by a discussion of the same by the authors and ministers who had felt themselves constrained to withdraw from the Missouri Synod on account of the grave errors that body had set out to promulgate. These brethren subsequently organized what was known as the Northwestern District of our Synod, and now as the Districts respectively of Wisconsin and Minnesota. The translation is by the brethren R. C. H. Lenski and W. E. Tressel.

The subject matter discussed in these several treatises is too vast and varied for even a synoptic review in these pages. Suffice it to say that the erudition, assiduity and conscientiousness of the authors, and of the translators as well, are the best guarantee any one can ask for that the book herewith recommended is a treasury of profound thought, nice reasoning and of rich information. May it find its way into the hands of many readers and prove itself of lasting good to them and through them to the Church at large.

C. H. L. Schuette.

Columbus, O., October 28, A. D. 1897.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY ON PREDESTINATION.

PAGE

Dogmatico Historical Introduction 3
A) Before the Formula of Concord 3
B) After the Formula of Concord 24
The Formula of Concord and the Old Lutheran Dogmaticians 39
The Doctrine of Predestination in the Missouri Synod 53
A) Before the Year 1877 53
B) The Synodical Report of the Western District for the Year 1877. 69
C) The Synodical Report of the Western District for the Year 1879. 88
D) "Altes und Neues" and "Lehre und Wehre" before the General Pastoral Conference at Chicago in the Autumn of 1880 106
E) The General Pastoral Conference in the Autumn of 1880 122
F) After the Pastoral Conference in the Autumn of 1880 140
G) Comparative Summary .....
1. What is predestination? .....
a) Old Missouri 165
b) Modern Missouri 165
c) The Calvinists 166
d) The Old Lutheran dogmaticians 166
2. What has God regarded in election? .....
a) Old Missouri 166
b) Modern Missouri 167
c) The Calvinists 167
d) The Lutheran Church 167
3. What is the relation especially of faith to election? ....
a) Old Missouri 168
b) Modern Missouri 168
c) The Calvanists 169
d) The Lutheran Church 169
4. In what sense does the Formula of Concord speak of election? .....
a) Old Missouri 169
b) Modern Missouri 169
c) The Lutheran Church 169
5. Is man's conversion and salvation in every sense independent of his conduct? .....
a) Old Missouri 170
b) Modern Missouri 170
c) The Calvinists 170
d) The Lutheran Church 170

G) Comparative Summary — Concluded. PAGE
6. May we speak of man's decision or "self-determination" in conversion?
a) Old Missouri ... 171
b) Modern Missouri ... 171
c) The Calvanists ... 171
d) The Lutheran Church ... 171
7. What is the difference between the Lutheran and Re- doctrine of election?
a) Old Missouri ... 172
b) Modern Missouri ... 173
c) Lutheran Theologians ... 173
d) Schneckenburger ... 174
8. How must the doctrine of the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century be regarded? ...
a) Old Missouri ... 175
b) Modern Missouri ... 175
c) Old Dogmaticians ... 175
9. How is the doctrine of Modern Missouri to be regarded?
a) Modern Missourians ... 176
b) Every impartial man ... 176
H) Appendix: An Ally of Modern Missouri in Germany ... 177
The Doctrine of Predestination in the Ohio Synod ... 185
Theologians of Seventeenth Century ... 185
Colloquium in Columbus, 1879 ... 186
Columbus Magazine ... 187
Meeting of Joint Synod 1881 ... 188

"INTUITU FIDEI."

PART I ... 191
What were the contents or the substance of the doctrine taught by our Lutheran Church Fathers, that God elected in view of faith? 193
Introductory Remarks ... 193
1. Over against Romanism ... 193
2. Sola Fide, Intuitu Fidei ... 193
3. Samuel Huber ... 195
4. Correct Understanding of Testimonies ... 197
a) Calvinists ... 197
b) Huber ... 197
c) Lutherans ... 198
5. Missouri's New Discovery ... 198
6. Missouri Holds Fast the Doctrine of our Old Teachers and also Rejects it ... 199
7. Meeting of Synodical Conference in Chicago ... 200
8. Quotations from Orthodox Publications and Teachers ... 200
A) *Authors of the Formula of Concord* ... 202
David Chytræus ... 202
Jacob Andreæ ... 206
Christopher Koerner ... 211

A) *Authors of the Formula of Concord* — Concluded. PAGE
Martin Chemnitz 211
Selnecker 228
B) *Original Subscribers and Defenders of the Formula of Concord.* 237
Aeg. Hunnius 237
The Wittenberg Faculty 250
The Wuerttemburg Theologians 265
John Wigand 276
Matthew Vogel 278
G. Mylius 278
Stephen Gerlach 282
Daniel Arcularius 288
John George Sigwart 290
Luke Backmeister and Jacob Color (And Chytræus) 291
David Lobech 295
John Wickelmann 298
Adam Francisci 304
Polycarp Leyser 310
Solomon Gesner 317
Wolfgang Mamphrasius 327
John Pappus 328
Andrew Schaafmann 329
Philip Nicolai 331
John Habermann 336
Matthias Hafenreffer 338
Luke Osiander 342
John Coler 345
Matthew Vogel 350
Concluding Remarks 368
C) *The Immediate Pupils of the Subscribers of the Formula of Concord.*
Introduction 381
Leonhard Hutter 384
Frederick Balduin 390
John Weber 396
David Runge 398
George Stampel 403
Joachim Zehner 403
Esaias Silberschlag 404
Wolfgang Franz 408
Balthasar Mentzer 409
Peter Piscator 420
John Schroeder 422
Luke Osiander, Jr 425
Albert Grauer 428
John Foerster 432
John Gerhard 434
Justus Feuerborn 437
Nicolas Hunnius 441

PAGE

C) The Immediate Pupils of the Subsbribers of the F. C. — Concluded.
Conrad Dietrich ... 445
Closing Remarks ... 447

PART II ... 449
I. *Did our Fathers depart from the Confession by teaching that the election of certain persons took place in view of faith?* ... 449
II. Does Missouri claim that our Fathers departed from the Confession with their doctrine of "election in view of faith" ... 455
Northern District and Prof. Fritschel ... 461
Professor Stœckhardt on "in view of faith." Philadelphia Faculty. Lehre und Wehre ... 463
III. Did Missouri hold to her present doctrine in 1872? ... 465
"Correct understanding" of a Symbol ... 468
IV. Colloquy in Columbus, 1879 and following it ... 475
Scripture, Fathers, Confession ... 476
Huberian Controversy—a test of the sense of the Eleventh Article ... 478
Three definitions of Election ... 478
Church of Formula of Concord knew of no election to salvation except of believers ... 480
Testimony of Wittenberg men ... 481
Rostock men ... 485
Tuebigen and Stuttgart Schools, Wuertemberg ... 486
V. Scriptures, ordination to salvation, Acta Huberiana, Wuertemberg men ... 489
Specific election ... 490
Regard to faith —Wittenberg and Wuertemberg men ... 491
Election and subsequent will ... 494
Grace of God and merits of Christ the complete cause of election ... 497
Did Rostock, Wittenberg, Tuebingen know the Lutheran definition of election? ... 500

PART III ... 505
I. *Is the Doctrine that God elected men to salvation in view of faith found in our Lutheran Confessions?* ... 505
II. Intuiti Fidei found in Book of Concord ... 509
Augsburg Confession and election ... 512
Apology and election ... 514
Difference between men and the divine verdict ... 517
Order of decree of election and order of eternal purpose ... 520
A mystery in this doctrine ... 521
III. The Formula of Concord ... 522
Third Article of Formula of Concord ... 525
Sonship and inheritance reflection of eternal counsel of God ... 529
IV. Eleventh Article ... 532
Election in detail ... 537
Trend of Eleventh Article against Calvinistic election ... 541
Revealed and hidden will of God ... 543
Definition of election ... 548
Election of grace ... 552

PAGE
Formula of Concord — Order of Salvation 555
VI.* Missouri guilty of misusing the Confession. 558
Third Thesis, 1879 562
Formula of Concord and man's conduct 565

A TESTIMONY AGAINST THE FALSE DOCTRINE OF MISSOURI ON PREDESTINATION.

General Introduction 571
Introduction of doctrinal discussion 573

THESIS I 577
Wider sense 580
Confession and universal counsel. 583
Dr. Luther's preface to Romans 589
Wider sense — Gospel 591

THESIS II. 593
Missouri — Faith in election — Faith in justification 598
Missouri doctrine of election and the biblical doctrine of grace 600
Thoughts of a troubled heart 603
Chemnitz, contingency 606
If you are to be saved 610
Romans II, 33, etc 613
Missouri repeating the role of old Israel 619
Election revealed in Scripture 621
Certainty of salvation conditional 625
A Missourian on the witness stand 628
Luther to a heart troubled about predestination 632
The windy thing on legs 635
Dr. Walther's Postille 642
Is it a mystery why God did not ordain all to eternal life? 645

THESIS III 648
Election revealed in the Gospel 648
Confession on "election revealed in the Gospel" 650
Words of Confession as chief point of controvery 652
Missouri and the thoughts of reason 659
Is redemption only for the elect? 670
The eight points 677
Missouri's false construction of the eight points refuted 679

THESIS IV 685
We place no merit in man 687
Dr. Walther's proof of our synergism 689
Luther, the Confession, the Scriptures, speak as we do 691
Baier and Huelsemann speak as we do 695
Quenstedt speaks likewise. 696
Faith impels God 702

* There is no V in the original.

PAGE

THESIS V 706
The point of controversy 707
Math. 22, 1—14 708
Chemnitz on Math. 22 713
Rom. 8, 28—30 714
"Foreknow" 718
Eph. 1, 3—6 724
2 Thess. 2, 13 730
1 Pet. 1, 1 and 2 736
Obedience 741
Review of Scripture passages 746
Analogy of faith 749
What elect means 754
Election and the preacher 757

APPENDIX.

Which of the two parties has forsaken their former standpoint? 760
Brief sketch of the inception of the controversy 789

The Present Controversy on Predestination:

A CONTRIBUTION TO ITS HISTORY AND PROPER ESTIMATE.

By

PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,

of the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, Columbus, Ohio.

Translated by

REV. R. C. H. LENSKI, A. M.

THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY

ON

PREDESTINATION:

A CONTRIBUTION TO ITS HISTORY AND PROPER ESTIMATE.

I.

DOGMATICO-HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

A. BEFORE THE FORMULA OF CONCORD.

Sin has most deeply depraved and corrupted man's body and soul together with all his powers. His mind and will, for instance, rarely choose by nature, even in earthly and temporal things, the golden middle-path; man is ever inclined to run to extremes, to deviate to the one side or the other. This proclivity inheres even in the best of Christians, because their depraved flesh and blood still clings to them. And it manifests itself in the most varied ways, in things bodily as well as in things spiritual, in the social and civil as well as in the religious and moral life. And we find that even the religious and dogmatic thinking of most men reveals this inborn onesidedness. All, even the worst of heresies contain at least a grain of truth, and have arisen in this very way that some truths were neglected or set aside, while others were in a onesided way emphasized and developed and thus perverted and distorted. We accordingly meet this onesidedeness repeatedly when we examine the History of Dogma on the doctrine of Predestination and subjects connected with it.

The doctrine of predestination held by any teacher or denomination in the church is in reality their final answer to the question as to the relation of human liberty to divine grace,—one of the most difficult, and at the same time one of the most important questions in the field of religion and dogmatics. In answering this question there appeared quite early the onesidedness just mentioned; the teachers of the Greek or Oriental Church laid the greatest stress on human liberty, while those in the older or Western Church placed most emphasis on divine grace. The former onesided view found its consistent outcome in Pelagianism, the other in an absolute predestination and in an irresistible grace.

The Greek teachers were influenced by their justifiable and even necessary opposition to the heathen, and especially Stoic,

philosophy with its doctrine of fate, "which rules with irresistible power the destiny of men, and reduces moral freedom to a minimum"; they were influenced likewise by their opposition to Gnosticism with its doctrine of evil created in man; and thus they permitted themselves to fall into the opposite extreme.

John of Damascus, the well-known representative dogmatician of the Greek Church (died about 760), gives expression to this view in the following words: "Election is in our own hands; the perfecting of the good, however, is something belonging to the co-operation of God (*τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ συνεργείας*), which is active in those who choose the good with an honest resolution. . . . Moral goodness has been implanted into our nature by God. He is the source and cause of all good, and without His co-operation and help (*συνέργεια καὶ βοήθεια*) all willing and doing of the good is impossible for us. Yet it is left to us, either to continue in moral goodness and to follow God, who calls us thereto, or to forsake the good, i. e., to turn to the evil and to follow the devil, who draws us thereto, although without coercion." (Thomasius, "Dogmengeschichte," I., 492.) With these synergistic principles predestination could, of course, be made to rest only on the divine foreknowledge of man's free conduct toward that which is good. John of Damascus speaks indeed quite correctly about an antecedent will of God desiring the salvation of all men, and about a subsequent will conferring salvation only upon a few; yet he wrongly rests this latter will on the divine foresight of the right, and wholly free, conduct of man toward things praiseworthy and blameworthy.

The chief representatives of the older Latin Church are Ambrosius of Milan (d. 397) and Augustine of Hippo Regius (d. 430). The former is not far removed from the view of the Greeks, although he emphasizes far more the depth of inherited depravity and the necessity of divine grace, which must precede the human will and prepare and enable it to choose the good. At least, he rests predestination on the divine foreknowledge of the good works or merits of the individual concerned: quorum merita præscivit, eorum præmia prædestinavit (whosesoever merits He foresaw, their rewards did He predestinate—referring to Rom. 8, 29).—Before the Pelagian controversy began even Augustine stood essentially on synergistic ground. According to his own confession in the Retractationes, he at that time thought that to believe and to will were in man's own power, and that God's part

was to bestow upon him who believed and willed the ability to do good, by His Holy Spirit, through whom love is poured out in our hearts (nostrum est credere et velle, illius autem dare credentibus et volentibus facultatem bene operandi per Spiritum Sanctum, per quem charitas diffunditur in cordibus nostris). This was the synergistic extreme to which Augustine permitted himself to be driven by his opposition to the dualistic and fatalistic Manicheism, whose satanic depths he had learned to understand in a painful experience of nine years. His later thorough understanding of the inherited depravity of human nature, of the doctrine of the Scriptures, of the process of his own conversion, and especially the warning example of Pelagianism, this recklessly consistent synergism; turned him back from this extreme. Over against Pelagius and his adherents with their denial of original sin and of the absolute necessity of divine grace, Augustine victoriously upheld both, and his work in this regard will ever be appreciated by the orthodox church. Unfortunately, however, he too was carried into an extreme, namely into an absolute predestination and an irresistible grace. Predestination he takes to be the eternal act of God, by which, from among the mass of men lost in sin, He infallibly foreordained those whom He would unto conversion, sanctification, and salvation, whilst He left the rest to their destruction. "For the elect, and only for them did Christ die; for them the saving institution of the Gospel exists; to them the efficacious call comes which also irresistibly produces its results in them; to them is given the donum" (perseverantiæ, the gift of perseverance) "which they cannot lose again. The rest God leaves (relinquit) to their destruction. And this is an act not of injustice, but of justice, for in this they receive only what they deserve for the sin in which they are entangled: pro meritis justissime judicantur; qui damnantur non habent quod reprehendant" (according to their merits they are most justly judged; they who are damned have no cause for complaint). "And there is also no especial decretum divinum reprobationis" (divine decree of reprobation), "inasmuch as the final cause of their damnation does not lie in this that God willed their destruction and caused their sin; but whosoever is lost perishes because he belongs to the race which has sinned in Adam. Whoever is saved has salvation purely and solely by grace. But why, when all are equally sinful and unworthy, God should elect the one and leave the other, this Augustine explains at times by declaring: 'That liberty may show itself

in all the clearer light,' and commonly by saying that man must here seal his lips, and bow his head in reverence beneath the unsearchable counsel of God." (Thomasius, ibid., p. 541.)—Concerning the operation of converting and saving grace Augustine has, among other utterances, the following: "When God wills to save no will of man resists. It is not to be doubted that no will of man can resist the will of God, which has made in heaven and earth all that He would, so that He should not do what He wills; inasmuch as He even does what He wills with the will of man himself. . . . And yet He does this in no way but through the will of man himself, as beyond doubt He has the most omnipotent power over the human heart to incline it whither He pleases." (Deo volenti salvum facere nullum hominum resistit arbitrium. Non est dubitandum, voluntati Dei, qui in coelo et in terra omnia, quæcumque voluit, fecit, humanas voluntates non posse resistere, quominus faciat ipse quod vult; quondoquidem de ipsis hominum voluntatibus, quod vult, facit. . . . Qui tamen hoc non facit nisi per ipsorum hominum voluntates, sine dubio habens humanorum cordium quo placeret inclinandorum omnipotentissimam potestatem.) Luthardt ("Die Lehre vom freien Willen," The Doctrine of Free Will, p. 36, sq.) summarizes the opinion of Augustine on this point in the following sentences: "It is the almighty God who turns the resisting will unto faith, operating therefore with the same unconditional will and power of omnipotence, which He exerts in the domain of nature, also in the domain of moral choice (self-determination), thus lowering it into a mere form of His own operation. God utilizes and determines also the evil will in the domain of sinful action according to His pleasure, so that here also He is the actor. Accordingly God turns the human will as He wills, agreeeably to His mercy or to His righteousness. Why He works in the one in this way and in the other in that, saves the one, permits the other to be lost—who can explain this? This is the secret will of God. And it is thus established, Augustine reiterates in his work De corr. et gr., that in all things God's will is to be acknowledged. For man can have no other will than God wills him to have; and whichever God's will wills him to have, that man must have, for God's will cannot fail of its result. These are, if not the words, yet the thoughts which Augustine here develops. As in our natural life, so also in the spiritual, all gifts are to be referred back to God's will, that is to His omnipotent will. And thus also perseverance in the good

is a pure gift of God's grace. For could not God have called those who fell away, out of the world before they fell? If He did not call them away, if He permitted them to fall, it was only because He did not will to give them the donum perseverantiæ" (the gift of perseverance), "with which, if they had had it, they could not have fallen. Those alone, however, to whom God gives this gift are children of God in His eyes. For those who fall away have in full truth never been children of God. They belong, indeed, to the vocati (the called), but not to the electi (the elect); for the latter cannot be lost. For the result must be in accordance with the will of God. These alone are sons of God; yet also all these, even if they have not yet been born again; yea, even if they have not yet been born at all. For only God's predetermining will is decisive here. With this will God's assisting grace and its operation coincides . . . New Testament grace, as the saints predestinated to the kingdom of God receive it, includes of necessity" (not only the possibility of perseverance, but also) "its actuality—non solum ut sine isto dono perseverantes esse non possint, verum etiam est per hoc donum nonnisi perseverantes sint" (not only that without this gift they cannot persevere, but also that through this gift they cannot otherwise than persevere).

Evidently it was nothing but self-deception when Augustine imagined that he could hold fast, together with these propositions of absolute predestination, the freedom of the will and the liberty of man, and when he even declared in his Retractationes: "Both faith and the production of good works is our own by reason of the liberty of our will,and both, therefore, have been imparted to us through the spirit of faith and love. Both are of God, because He prepares our will; and both are our own, because we will them." It is only playing with words to say of a will of God, operating unavoidably and insuperably (indeclinabiliter et insuperabiliter), bringing the most almighty power to bear in an irresistible manner, that this will does not coerce the will of man, since it works not without but in him, as also the operations, faith and love, are in the strictest sense acts of man's free will. This is true only in the sense that, taken strictly, the will itself can never be coerced, but only man, to will as he wills, and therefore it really says nothing. It was likewise a strange self-deception when Augustine imagined that his doctrine agreed with the Scriptures; and only by the delusion into which the most shrewd and approved influential theologian may fall, when once he has fully started on a

onesided line, can it be explained, that Augustine did not scruple to misinterpret the beautiful passage 1 Tim. 2, 4: "Who will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth," in numberless ways: sometimes "all men" are taken as all those of whom God wills that they shall come to grace, hence only the elect. Again, they are taken as men of all kinds and all branches of the human family; again, simply as many; again, the passage is thought to say that no man can be saved except God will it; again, that it can be said of God, that He would have all men to be saved, because He induces us to wish this!

It is to be ascribed, at least in great part, to this unevangelical onesidedness and harshness of Augustine's doctrine that his contention against Pelagianism did not receive undivided approval in the church, especially in that of the West. Augustine was undoubtedly right over against Pelagius; for the latter carried the onesided view of the Greek Church, with which he had become conversant through its writings or through a visit to the East, consistently to its last extreme, making predestination depend on the divine foreknowledge of man's free choice (self-determination), which really needs no grace; and this good work of Augustine the church acknowledged. His own onesidedness, however, could not be adopted. Yet to offset this the whole truth was unfortunately not taken. The middle-path between the extremes of Pelagius and Augustine was not really chosen, although this was intended; repelled by the predestinarianism of the latter, a course too near Pelagianism was entered. This is the Semi-Pelagianism of John Cassianus, a pupil and friend of the Greek Chrysostom and of his likeminded adherents, the Massilians. "The relation of grace to free will Cassianus sets forth as a constant being-side-by-side and working together of both, in which he makes the good proceed at one time from grace, at another from human choice (self-determination). Which of the two is the rule cannot be decided a priori. Experience shows, on the one hand, that God anticipates man in that He calls him, yea, at times draws some without or against their will unto salvation," e. g., the publican Matthew, the Apostle Paul; on the other hand, that man also without being moved or solicited from without, wholly from within, disposes himself for the good and makes the beginning (initium fidei et boni operis), e. g., Zacchæus, or the malefactor on the cross" (?). (Thomasius, ibid., p. 561.) Here predestination was made to rest entirely on the divine foreknowledge of the moral

condition of man. This controversy between Pelagianism and Augustinianism, waged especially in France, was finally closed for several centuries at the Council of Orange in the year 529. Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism were rejected with all clear ness and decision, likewise the most objectionable form of predestinarianism, predestination unto evil, which, to be sure, neither Augustine nor, as far as we know, any adherent of his doctrine has ever maintained. Irresistible grace, however, and the particularism of predestination were passed over in silence.

How the Western Church, without being conscious of the fact, gradually left the standpoint of Augustine, who was honored as the highest authority, we see in Gregory the Great (d. 604). God has elected those from eternity of whom He foresaw that they would accept His grace and persevere therein unto the end. Suos et electos nominat, quia cernit, quod in fide et bono opere persistant (He calls them His own and His elect, because He sees that they persevere in faith and good work). This juxtaposition of faith and good work already reveals the Semi-Pelagian position of Gregory, and indeed it forms the transition to the Semi-Pelagianism of the Romish Church later on. This position of Gregory is shown even more fully by his declarations on the relation between divine grace and human action. "Man, sick with sin, in need of a physician, must be willing to be helped, if he is to be healed. Grace alone heals him of his disease; but the fact that he receives this grace willingly is his merit. The good that we do is the result of a co-operation between God and ourselves. . . . Grace is anticipating and liberating, but the subsequens liberum arbitrium" (the subsequent free will) "consents (consentit), and this establishes the meritum liberi arbitrii" (merit of free will). Foreordination is determined according to the conduct of free will toward prevenient and liberating grace; it rests on the foreknowledge of this conduct." (Luthardt, ibid., p. 53.) In the first half of the 9th century, however, the monk Gottschalk, detained against his will in a monastery, and then seeking comfort in the study of Augustine's writings, revived this father's doctrine of predestination in its harshest form; indeed, he developed it to a double foreordination, that of the elect unto life and that of the reprobate unto death, although Augustine as a rule had spoken only of a committal (relinquishing) of the evil to their deserved punishment. The cruel treatment of Gottschalk by his ecclesiastical superiors made many sympathize with him,

and his doctrine, too, found much approval; yet workrighteousness, which became ever more influential both theoretically and practically, and from which Augustine also had not been free, turned attention more and more away from the doctrine of Gottschalk. The most powerful of the scholastics, Thomas Aquinas, however, still endeavored to harmonize the absolute predestinarianism of Augustine with Semi-Pelagian principles. According to him, it is divine grace which enables man to perform good and meritorious works. This grace, however, is bestowed according to an absolute predestination upon the one and not upon the other. His antipode, Duns Scotus, made predestination conditional on the divine foreknowledge of man's free conduct. According to him grace does not, as is taught by Thomas, necessarily come first, but man may, and should, make himself fit to receive this grace, by a proper use of his free will. And it is Duns Scotus, and not Thomas, who has left his stamp upon the Romish Church, the stamp of Semi-Pelagianism. It was in vain that Thomas of Bradwardina, succeeding his renowned namesake in his ecclesiastical order and in his opinions (d. 1349 as the Archbishop of Canterbury), endeavored to maintain the cause of free and unconditional divine grace over against the error of Pelagianism. The absolute predestination and the irresistibility of the saving will of God, which he too thought necessary for this purpose, found a refuge more and more only among the so-called heretics. Among these were Wiclif and Hus. The former writes in his Dialogus: "And thus it appears to me probable that God moves each single active creature with necessity to its every activity. And thus some are predestined, i. e. appointed after their labor unto glory; others foreknown, i. e. appointed after a miserable life to perpetual punishment. (Et sic videatur mihi probabile, quod Deus necessitat creaturas singulas activas ad quemlibet actum suum. Et sic sunt aliqui praedestinati, hoc est post laborem ordinati ad gloriam; alii præsciti, hoc est post vitam miseram ad poenam perpetuam ordinati.) Hus is dependent here, as well as in general, not only as far as the matter itself, but also as far as the manner of expression is concerned, upon Wiclif. And thus it came to pass that predestinarianism was regarded ever more and more as the mark and production of heresy, and the opposite extreme of Semi-Pelagianism as the true doctrine of the Christian Church.

It was no wonder that Luther and those whom God placed

at his side and under his leadership in the blessed work of the Reformation, at first assumed more or less the standpoint of Augustine in their absolutely necessary opposition to the prevailing Semi-Pelagianism. In Luther this was all the less surprising, as he was an Augustinian monk, and seems to have studied the writings of Augustine in the latter years of his monastic life with special zeal. The work of Luther which here demands chief attention is his De servo arbitrio, of the year 1525. What judgment the Lutheran Church, by its most important teachers, has passed on this much discussed book, we have endeavored to set forth in Vol. III. of the "Columbus Theological Magazine," pp. 213-230, in an article entitled: "The Voice of the Lutheran Church Concerning Luther's Book 'De Servo Arbitrio.'" We give here only the main points of this more extended discussion. According to Walch in his edition of Luther's works, Vol. XVIII., p. 124, sqq., Lutheran theologians, as to their opinion on this work of Luther, can be divided into three classes. The first class thinks that "Luther has expressed himself on predestination in this book in such a manner that he in fact agrees with Calvin and his adherents." To this class belong the theological members of the strictly Lutheran University of Rostock in the year 1595, 15 years after the first publication of the Book of Concord. This its Opinion the faculty expresses in a judgment given on Huber's doctrine of predestination, which will be referred to later; and the writer of this Opinion is one of the chief authors of the Formula of Concord, David Chytræus, most certainly an unquestionably Lutheran theologian. This judgment is addressed to the theological faculty of Wittenberg. After quoting a few of the strongest expressions of Luther's work, it continues: "These and many similar exceedingly terrible utterances, which at that time were taught in your school as divine revelations, are now nowhere retained except in the schools of the Calvinists. Philippus (Melanchthon) our common teacher, has gradually softened and removed them . . . . and this already while Luther was living." (Haec et multa his similia, horridiora, quæ tunc in vestra cathedra velut oracula docebantur, nunc nusquam nisi in Calvinianorum scholis retinentur, Philippus, communis praeceptor noster, paullatim leniit et sustulit . . . idque vivo adhuc Luthero.) To this class belongs also Dr. F. A. Philippi (d. 1882 as professor at Rostock), in our opinion the greatest Lutheran dogmatician since Hollaz. In his work, "Kirchliche Glaubenslehre," Vol. 4, 1, 2d ed., p. 37, we

read: "Erasmus attacked in his work, De Libero Arbitrio, the vital principle of the Reformation, and endeavored to bring the church to reject the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation and to return to the Romish Semi-Pelagianism; and moreover he treated absolute predestination as the necessary result of the Augustinian doctrine of sin and grace, and used it as a bugbear. Thereupon Luther, to assure the safety of the evangelical basis of salvation, made a truly gigantic assault on this theological dwarf in his work, De Servo Arbitrio, and did not hesitate to draw also the inferences from his position, but accepted, with an over-bold defiance born of faith, on the one hand, the theological deduction of an unconditional election, from the premise of the enslaved will, and, on the other hand, the speculative deduction of the bondage of the will, from the premise of an unconditional omnipotence and an eternal prescience. Yet Luther merely accepted the position offered him by his opponent, and permitted himself for the moment to be carried so far beyond his goal only by his opposition. In reality he sought rather to establish a basis than to draw conclusions. And then in his doctrine of justification, and the central position which this assumed with him, as well as in his doctrine of the means of grace, there was shown, already at that time and still more later on, an irreconcilable opposition against this absolute predestination, whereby it was bound to be completely superseded. And therefore, Luther not only never after accepted this doctrine, but taught in fact the very opposite of it in his unequivocal proclamation of the universality of divine grace, of the universal application of Christ's merits, of the universal operation of the means of grace; and he even controverted this doctrine and took back his earlier utterances on this point by his later corrections." A similar position is taken by other noteworthy Lutheran theologians of to-day.

The second class of Lutheran theologians maintains "that Luther used expressions in his work, De Servo Arbitrio, which in themselves are not to be approved, and appear to declare an absolute decreee of God concerning man's salvation and his condemnation; that he is nevertheless to be excused," inasmuch as at that time "the light of evangelical knowledge had not yet fully dawned for him," or inasmuch as he used inconsiderate and imprudent expressions without a Calvinistic meaning on his part, or inasmuch as he treated the matter "more philosophically than theologically," etc. To this class the majority of our older theologians be-

long, e. g., M. Chemnitz, John Gerhard, A. Calov, V. E. Loescher, etc. Some of them almost agree with the first class, namely those who assume that at that time Luther yet lacked "the full light of evangelical knowledge."

The third class is a very small one, and consists of those Lutheran theologians who claim that there is "nothing erroneous and questionable contained in these expressions, but that everything is correctly set forth in them, if only they are taken in Luther's sense." The most prominent of these theologians is, among the older, Seb. Schmidt, among the later, A. G. Rudelbach.

Our present opinion we have already indicated above. Formerly, and also in the article referred to, we were inclined rather to the second class. However, the first class seems to be in the right, as their explanation seems to be the most natural and least strained, and because it is established that Luther at this time had not yet in all things attained his later clearness. The following passages, for instance, seems to us to demand this explanation: "The will of God is efficacious and cannot be impeded, as it is the natural power of God (Voluntas Dei efficax est, quæ impediri non potest, cum sit naturalis ipsa potentia Dei)."—"He does everything in an immutable way, and His will can neither be resisted, nor changed, nor impeded (Immutabiliter omnia facit et voluntati ejus neque resisti neque eam mutari aut impediri posse)."—"It is God for whose will neither cause nor reason can be given. For not because He should will, or should have willed, thus, is that right which He wills, but on the contrary, because He Himself willed it, therefore, whatever occurs must be right (Deus est cujus voluntatis nulla est causa nec ratio. Non enim quia sic debet vel debuit velle, ideo rectum est quod vult, sed contra, quia ipse vult, ideo debet rectum esse quod fit)."—"It is therefore also especially necessary and salutary for a Christian to know that God foresees nothing contingent, but that He foresees and ordains and does all things with His immutable and eternal and infallible will. With this stroke free will is entirely crushed and annihilated (Est itaque et hoc inprimis necessarium et salutare Christiano nosse, quod Deus nihil præscit contingenter, sed quod omnia incommutabili et æterna infallibilique voluntate et prævidit et proponit et facit)."—"If there had been in Pharaoh a possibility of turning or liberty of the will, so that he might have done the opposite, then God could not have predicted his obduracy so certainly (Si hic ulla erat vertibilitas aut libertas

arbitrii in Pharaone, quæ in utrumque potuisset, non potuisset Deus tam certo prædicere ejus obdurationem)."—"The wicked man comes not, even though he hear the word, except the Father inwardly draw and teach him, which He does by bestowing His Spirit. Here is another kind of drawing than that which is from without" (through the mere Word) "(Impius non venit, etiam audito verbo, nisi intus trahat doceatque Pater, quod facit largiendo Spiritum. Ibi alius tractus est quam is, qui foris est)." —"This is the hidden and fearful will of God, by which He determines in His counsel which and what kind of people shall, according to His will become fit for and partake of His preached and proffered mercy. And this will is not to be searched into, but to be reverently worshipped as the most adorable mystery of divine majesty, which He has reserved for Himself alone and forbidden us."—"God, hidden in His majesty, does neither deplore nor remove the death (of the sinner), but works life, death, and all in all. For He has not restricted Himself in this regard in His Word, but has reserved for Himself liberty over all things.—For He (God as preached) would have all men to be saved, when with His word of salvation He comes to all; and it is the fault of the will which receives Him not, as He says, Matth. 23: How often would I have gathered thy children and ye would not! Why, however, that majesty does not remove this fault of our will or change it in all men since this is not in man's power, or why He imputes it to a man when he cannot avoid it, is not for us to inquire, and though we should inquire much, we would still not discover it. (Deus absconditus in majestate neque deplorat neque tollit mortem, sed operatur vitam, mortem et omnia in omnibus. Neque enim tum verbo suo definivit sese sed libertum sese reservavit super omnia.—Nam ille (Deus prædicatus) vult omnes homines salvos fieri, dum verbo salutis ad omnes venit, vitiumque est voluntatis, quæ non admittit eum sicut dicit Matth. 23: quoties volui congregare filios tuos, et noluisti. Verum quare majestas illa vitium hoc voluntatis nostræ non tollit aut mutat in omnibus, cum non sit in potestate hominis, aut cur illud ei imputat, cum non possit homo eo carere, quærere non licet, ac si multum quæras, nusquam tamen invenias.)"— This assuredly is not the manner of expression nor the doctrine of the later Luther, nor of the Confessions of the Church bearing his name. When our latest Confession appeals to this book of Luther in the article on the Free Will, it does

this referring at the same time to his later exposition of Genesis, where the subject is not only "repeated and explained," but where he has also, "in the best and most careful way, guarded against all misunderstanding and perversion, his opinion and understanding of some other peculiar disputations introduced incidentally by Erasmus, as of Absolute Necessity, etc. (Formula of Concord, Sol. Decl. II., 44, Jacobs' Translation, p. 560, 561). But that Luther's De Servo Arbitrio can be prized even by those who recognize those defects is seen by the quotation from Philippi above and also by the following utterances of Luthardt (ibid., p. 122): "It is a powerful composition, defiant and confident, bold in word and thought, full of holy zeal, of mighty earnestness, written from the deepest convictions of his soul. It is one of the most important and richest of Luther's writings. And it is easily understood that in later years, when he was displeased with his other writings and with Saturnine hunger would have destroyed these children of his spirit, he named this work, beside the Catechism, as among those which he could acknowledge as his true writings. For scarcely anywhere else do the waters of his soul pour themselves forth with equal power and richness."

At first Melanchthon went, if possible, even further than Luther in his doctrine of the absolute will of God. This appears from the following utterances: "Free will is a ridiculous invention, because our will is so little free, that it turns only in the direction toward which God impels it (ut eo tantum feratur, quorsum a Deo impellitur)."—"We say that God does not only permit His creatures to act, but that properly He Himself works all things (ipsum omnia proprie agere). — As they confess that the conversion of Paul was properly God's work (proprium Dei opus), so they should confess (fatentur?—most probably: fateantur or fatemur) that those works also which are called Adiaphora, as for instance eating freely, things we have in common with the animals (qua media vocantur ut comedere libere communia cum brutis), as also those which are evil, as David's adultery, are properly God's work.—Now it is established that God does all things not merely permissively, but potentially (non permissive, sed potenter), so that, to use a phrase of Augustine, Judas' betrayal as well as Paul's call is His own proper work (proprium opus)."—"There is, therefore, no reason why we should accept the frigid explanation (frigidum glossema) that God permits evil, yet does not work it Himself."—"In the first place, it is not in

man's power to prepare himself for salvation. It is not in our power to convert ourselves. From this it follows, that since many are not converted, God does not will to save them."—"They believed not because they were not chosen."—"All that takes place, takes place necessarily according to the divine predestination. There is no liberty of the will."—Gradually Melanchthon came not only to give up this awful standpoint, but even went to the other extreme, embracing synergism, by accepting three causes of conversion, namely, the Word of God, the Holy Spirit, and the consenting will of man; he maintained, that the natural man had the facultas applicandi se ad gratiam (the faculty of applying himself to the grace of God). And in this course Melanchthon was followed by his whole school; Philippists and synergists have become synonimous terms. One of the main representatives of this school was Victorin Strigel. He compared free will to a magnet, which, when covered with the juice of garlic, ceased to attract iron, but the moment this outward hindrance is removed, again exerts its own proper power, the manifestation of which had only been arrested outwardly (comp. F. C., art. II., Jacobs' Transl., p. 554, 15 and p. 556, 22). Evidently, the doctrine of predestination held by this school could not be correct.

The leader of the strictly Lutheran tendency, which battled with all its energy against Philippism, was Flacius. In a lengthy debate with Strigel, as is well known, he allowed his well-founded opposition to Strigel's synergistic interpretation of the word accidens to force him to the proposition, that original sin is no accident at all, but the very substance of fallen man. By substance (substantia formalis or forma substantialis) he meant that which gives to man his peculiar condition morally, especially the moral attitude of his soul's highest powers, of his reason and will. Prior to the fall this was the image of God, perfect holiness and righteousness; after the fall it was original sin. "The change in the relation of these powers to each other, their destruction and degeneration, this was what Flacius understood by the new forma substantialis which has entered man in consequence of the fall. And if these terms are at all employed, it must be confessed that the expression forma substantialis is to be preferred to the other, forma accidentalis." This is the judgment of Preger in his admirable work, "Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit" (M. F. I. and his Times), which dare not be overlooked by those who would understand aright the times of the "Thirty Years' War"

within the Lutheran Church, extending from the death of Luther to the publication of the Formula of Concord. And yet, if we consent to call "all that is (alles, was da ist)" either substance or accident, taking these terms in their usual significance, we cannot, as far as the terms are concerned, avoid siding with Strigel over against Flacius, as does the Formula of Concord in its first article (Jacobs' Transl. p. 549, etc.). To be sure, everything then depends on setting forth what kind of an accident original sin is, namely the total depravity and wholly perverted tendency of man's noblest powers. Little or nothing can be objected to Flacius' explanation of his hitherto unheard-of expressions. "It must not be overlooked that in reality the disputants differed but slightly, and that Flacius meant by his forma substantialis what Melanchthon had placed among the qualitates." "He meant by his calling original sin forma substantialis in summo gradu nothing but what his opponents also meant." "And for this reason alone the proposition of Flacius concerning sin as a kind of substance seemed dangerous to his opponents, because they understood by substance merely that which is material, that which, according to the popular notion, can subsist for itself." Flacius, accordingly, was misunderstood by his opponents, and the Formula of Concord does not really condemn his opinion in its first article, but rather his mode of expression, as also its interpretation by his opponents and by some of his own adherents. Flacius then did not make "the devil the creator of a new substance, but the corruptor of a good substance. He did not make God the creator of sin, but taught with Luther that God formed man out of the matter which the devil had corrupted; in the corrupt substance he distinguished matter and form, and of the form of the soul-substance he called only the higher, moral form original sin." And therefore, he did not before his death, as Kurtz, for instance, asserts, retract the expression which he understood correctly, into which, however, both synergists as well as strict Lutherans uncharitably put an interpretation wholly repudiated by himself. "But in spite of this we must note that Flacius drew false inferences from his view. The Wittenberg school and Strigel had a right to maintain against Flacius that conversion takes place not without and not against the will of man, as Flacius taught. And Hesshusius and his friends were right when they contended that God did not form man out of a simply sinful substance, and that the idea of God was not wholly obliterated in man. These doctrines of Flacius, how-

ever, resulted from his extending the power of original sin too far, and from his annihilating completely all that is commonly connected with the remnant of the divine image in man; thus he lost the true idea of man's capacity for salvation." "According to Flacius conversion is always a violent act, performed without the will of man, indeed, against his will, and all responsibility on his part is taken away." Beyond doubt this view had much to do with the choice of the controverted expression; although, according to the exposition of its originator, it may be understood correctly. And its logical outcome had to be an absolute predestination. Flacius repells this doctrine, his associates in the contest against synergism, as also those who later on became his opponents, express it without hesitancy. Wigand for instance teaches a grace which is particular from the start, and consequently finds himself compelled, like Augustine, to misinterpret passages such as these: "There is no respect of persons with God," and "God will have all men to be saved." "God's having no respect to persons simply signifies that He gathers His church from among all peoples, without regard to differences of sex or gifts." "All men" are "all conditions of men." Hesshusius says directly: "Here" (Rom. 9, 22) "the apostle discusses the causes, why God in His election passed by some and left them in their condemnation, viz: That He might constitute in them an example of His burning wrath against sin. God, therefore, does not in this respect want all to be saved; for He has not elected all and does not draw all by His grace." And Amsdorf writes: "As stones and blocks are in the power of God, so also the will and mind of man is subject to the will of God (in voluntate Dei), and consequently man cannot in the least will or choose, except what God wills or declares, whether it be in grace or in wrath." And it must be admitted that Luthardt in a certain sense is right when he says (ibid., p. 244): "As long as such doctrine could be taught in the Church, and that by such an illustrious representative of the past and such a close friend of Luther, so long—it must be confessed—the Philippistic school was a necessity," i. e., to counter-balance and prevent the total and exclusive domination of this view. "For this determinism endangered the most essential moral interests of practical Christianity."

"In the beginning of the Reformation nearly all the representatives of the evangelical church who touched upon this question, taught an absolute predestination, an eternal foreordination

of some unto salvation, and of others unto damnation." (Thomasius, ibid., II., 623). "And so Luther also exhibited the teaching of the evangelical church at this time, when he put forth his predestinarian propositions against Erasmus. But the Church had not yet attained purity and clearness in this doctrine, and was endangered thereby also in other respects. Through the Word, it was said, God carries out His election and His counsel. But the Word is directed to the many, to the masses. And so the conclusion seemed plain, that God sent the proclamation of salvation to many only seemingly, and that His Spirit does not operate everywhere through the Word as a means of grace. Then again, the peace and security of the conscience was made doubtful; and further, there was no satisfactory answer to the question, Where is the church?" (G. Plitt, "Einleitung in die Augustana"—Introduction to the A., I., 363.) With Luther, however, and his pupils absolute predestination was only an auxiliary, which at first seemed necessary to them to guard the center, salvation by grace alone; and the Lutheran Church therefore dropped this doctrine, or rather never took it up, when it was seen that it was not necessary to shield this central point, that in fact by its unavoidable consequences it annulled the Biblical and Lutheran doctrine of the means of grace. It was quite different with the fathers of the Reformed Church. Absolute predestination was the center of its entire theology, and its doctrine of the means of grace had to conform to this. Consequently this Church has no means of grace in the Lutheran sense, and can have none. Zwingli, for instance, writes in a letter of the year 1527: "It must be an unalterable canon that all things are ruled and directed by the providence of God; otherwise God would not be God, would not be the all-wise and eternal Being. He worketh both to will and to do. Should some one ask whether he can cater to his lusts, since all that he does is done through God,—the questioner, by his very question shows whose sheep he is. Suppose we grant that through God's ordering this man becomes a murderer, yet it is the result of God's goodness alone that by these signs he who becomes a vessel of wrath betrays himself in that he commits the crime without repentance. I say: They become such through God's ordering (Vorsehung), but by the same ordering they are appointed unto eternal punishment. There you have my canon, which fortifies me against all the Scripture passages adduced in favor of free will." And in another place: "Election precedes

faith. Thus it comes that they who have been elected and have not attained to the knowledge of faith, as for instance children, nevertheless receive eternal salvation; for it is election that saves."—"If, however, the attainment of salvation is attributed to faith, then that which originates from the primary and actual cause is ascribed to something secondary, which is, as it were, only a seal. For faith is the seal of the election through which I am actually saved. If election had not preceded as the blossom never would faith have followed."—"Everything that takes place with regard to man, whether it apply to his body or to his soul, proceeds from God as the real and only cause, so that even the work of sin (opus peccati) proceeds from none other than God, although it is not sin for Him."—"Faith itself does not save, speaking accurately, but it is a sign of salvation and election. The Father's drawing saves and justifies, and the operation of the Holy Spirit; faith, however, is the sign of all the elect." (Compare Thomasius, ibid., p. 412, sqq.) And Zwingli never retracted this. "This doctrine of predestination remained in Reformed theology. Hence no one took offense when Calvin gave it a very rigid form." The following are the main features: "From all eternity God has ordained salvation for some men and damnation for others. Men are thus not equally conditioned when they enter life. Christ's work of redemption pertains only to the elect. For them alone, therefore, the means of grace are what they claim to be; for only in their case do they work eternal life. Although these thoughts did not enter practical life in the form of such abstract conclusions, but were broken and modified by practical tendencies and necessities; yet it cannot be denied that here there is a view different from the Lutheran. The Lutheran doctrine of the appropriation of salvation (Heilsaneignung) can never exist beside such a doctrine of predestination and its consequences. This doctrine denies the universality of the grace of God and of the merits of Christ, whereon alone the sinner's consolation rests; indeed, it destroys the very conception of compassionate grace, since it places over against it a punishing justice, which for its own glorification has made and appointed some of its creatures to be vessels of wrath. The seriousness of the divine proclamation and offer of salvation is thus made doubtful for the individual sinner, since an outward and an inward call are distinguished, yea, separated from each other, and thereby the prom-

ise made in the preached Word robbed of its truth, and faith, which rests altogether on the means of grace, robbed of its certainty.

Yet the difference in doctrine between the two churches also on this point was not at once recognized as such. As Luther took no offense at Zwingli's sermon on predestination which he heard in 1529 at Marburg, so also other Lutheran theologians, after the controversy on the sacraments was renewed, saw nothing objectionable in the predestinarian utterances of their opponents. The Philippists, it is true, like their leader, were not satisfied with these expressions. But the very theologians who were the means of advancing the Confession and bringing about the Formula of Concord, were yet attached in good part to predestination, attached to it manifestly because of their efforts thus to destroy synergism in the root." Among these was, for instance, Flacius, although very guardedly; furthermore Brenz, Wigand, Amsdorf, Hesshus, Heerbrand; cf. Frank, "Theologie der Konkordienformel," IV., 125, 254 et sq. "Not till the year 1561 did predestination become a mooted question between Reformed and Lutheran theologians, and this was occasioned by differences occuring at Strassburg between Hieronymus Zanchi and John Marbach." (Thomasius, ibid., 625, sqq.)

Zanchi was an adherent of the strict doctrine of predestination. Marbach did not deny that there is a predestination of the elect, and that by virtue of the divine knowledge there are also a definite number of reprobate. The real dispute turned on the donum perseverantiæ (the gift of perseverance), as Zanchi maintained, and Marbach denied, that the elect received faith only once and could never fully lose it. An actual decision was not reached even now, since the real difference was not yet clearly defined. In the year 1563 a formula of agreement was signed, but by Zanchi only with the reservation of his own interpretation. The formula was probably composed by Jacob Andreæ. Calvin said of it, that it did not deny predestination, but covered it with a veil. Thomasius (ibid., 629) is right in saying: "The Strassburg Formula lay wholly along the line which Lutheran theology had for some time taken in the doctrine of predestination, rather feeling its way instinctively than seeing it clearly. . . . The formula was, in the line of sound dogmatico-historical development, the foundation of the corresponding article in the Formula

of Concord, its author, as is well known, using the formula extensively." It wants predestination to be taught so "as never to appear to rob the distressed conscience of repentance, or of consolation and hope." Predestination is, therefore, to be sought only in Christ, as far as He has revealed it, and by all men. "The revealed will of God, being in no wise contradicted by His secret will, is set before us in Christ, to whom all must hold." "The fact that God who calls all does not give faith to all, is a secret known only to God, and never to be fathomed by the human mind." —"The difference had come to be felt. That the contest ceased for the time, was due to the vacillation and indefiniteness to some extent yet existing concerning predestination in the Lutheran Church; as also to this that as yet no threatening danger was apprehended from the Calvinistic doctrine on this point, as was the case regarding the sacraments. In the first draught of the formula of agreement from the pen of Andreæ there is no mention of predestination. When, after treating of other differences, an article 'Of God's Eternal Foreknowledge and Election,' was introduced into the Formula of Concord as it took shape, it was thought necessary to justify its admission in a certain sense by these words: 'Concerning this article no public dissension has occured among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession.' The article, therefore, referred more to the future than to the past. There were no long dogmatico-historical controversies to be settled by this article, but rather such controversies were to be prevented, at least in the Lutheran Church itself. And for this the Church felt prepared. After it had been decided to discuss this doctrinal difference in the Confession also, a firm and fixed stand was taken . It was known that for all that was to be said here an actual uniform doctrine of the Lutheran Church could be appealed to . . . This article contains a summary of all the preceding articles, or rather it reveals their organic unity, as it goes back to the eternal will of God, which is realized in the entire revelation of salvation (Heilsoffenbarung). Certainly, it cannot be said that by these declarations all difficulties are solved, nor that all the single propositions of the Confession are scientifically harmonized with each other. It cannot be denied that there is some lack of clearness in this respect. But the scientific result is not the first consideration in a confessional statement. The question is whether it gives expression to the common faith. Now, the facts

of the Lutheran faith have been expressed by the Formula of Concord. Also in this place it testifies of the evangelical doctrine of free grace in Christ, and does so by declaring, first, its absolute importance as the sole foundation of our salvation, over against Semi-Pelagianism, and, secondly, its universality, over against a false particularism." (Thomasius, ibid., 629 sqq.)

I.

DOGMATICO-HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

B. AFTER THE FORMULA OF CONCORD.

"In the beginning of the Reformation nearly all the representatives of the evangelical church who touched upon this question taught an absolute predestination, an eternal foreordination of some to salvation and of others to damnation." This was true of Luther and Melanchthon as well as of Zwingli and Calvin, although predestination with the former did not assume the all-controlling position it had with the latter. Although the Lutheran and Biblical doctrine of the means of grace is not consistent with this doctrine of predestination, we find even after Luther's death some of his pupils still defending it: for instance Wigand, Hesshusius, and Amsdorf. This has been set forth more fully in the preceding discussion. The Formula of Concord thereupon furnished the true principles for understanding this difficult doctrine and furnished them in full accord with the general Biblical position of the Lutheran Church, and in direct opposition to the doctrine of Zwingli and Calvin, yet refraining from entering dogmatically upon all the different questions concerned. It was quite natural that there were, even after the publication of this Confession, some few Lutherans who for a time expressed themselves in the former, seemingly Calvinistic manner on predestination. Chr. Cornerus, for instance, himself one of the authors of the Formula of Concord, wrote on Rom. 9, in his commentary, published 1583, that it depends upon the mere will of God (situm esse in mera Dei voluntate) whether He shows mercy to a man so as to save him, or whether He neglects him (vel negligat eum) so that he perishes in his guilt. Jacob Heerbrand, author of one of the most widely read compends of theology, teaches in his Disputatio de Prædestinatione in an altogether Calvinistic manner, using these words: "The reason that many fall away, of whom it is written that they had faith, is to be thus understood, that they had faith for a time without the true regen-

eration of the Spirit. . . . Since all have such" (corrupt) "hearts, God by His Holy Spirit softens the hearts of some (namely of the elect) and enlightens them; others, however, whom He will, He leaves to themselves because of their own sin." Yet over against this view a thoroughgoing Anticalvinistic mode of thought and expression was developed and constantly gained more ground. We read, for instance, in the "Gründliche Widerlegung" (Thorough Refutation) of the "Staffortisches Buch" (one of the most prominent Reformed controversial works against the Formula of Concord) which appeared at Wittenberg in 1602: "The fact that God brings some to repentance is due to reasons which God sees in the hearts of men, which we, however, cannot see." And Ægidus Hunnius, one of the chief supporters and defenders of the Formula of Concord over against all Calvinistic and crypto-Calvinistic attacks, writes in his Articulus de libero arbitrio s. humani arbitrii viribus (Rostock, 1598), p. 68: "The absence of repentance is not to be explained by synergism, as though a man would not believe when he could" (i. e., of his own power), "nor is it to be explained by an absolute decree, but according to the Scriptures by a third reason lying in the middle between these two, by the despising of the order and means of salvation." (Compare with this Heppe's Dogmatics of German Protestanism in the 16th Century. Vol. 2, p. 32, sqq.)

This same Hunnius is the man who first used the expression "Election in view of faith" in the controversy with the Calvinists then constantly increasing, a term which found general acceptance among all true Lutheran theologians, since, as a brief technical term for the expression "in view of the merits of Christ embraced and held fast to the end by faith," it defines precisely the Lutheran position over against the Calvinistic absolute election. In the Refutatio Thesium Tossani, printed in front of his Articulus de Providentia Dei et æterna Prædestinatione seu Electione filiorum Dei ad salutem (of the year 1597), Hunnius, for instance, says (fol. e., 3,): "We dare not so conceive of this mystery, as though God had first unconditionally chosen a certain number of persons without regard to the order of salvation, simply casting the others away, and had then established this order of salvation only for those whom He so elected, as a means for bringing them to salvation. On the contrary, if the justice of God was to remain inviolate, without regard to this order, i. e., to Christ's merits, suffering, and death, which must be embraced

by faith, no sinner could be elected to eternal life, except there be shown in this order some means whereby the eternal and infinite righteousness of God might be satisfied, so that this election of sinners to the heavenly kingdom might take place." Again (fol. e., 4) he says: "The reader must note that Tossanus in his accusations constantly understands by 'cause' a meritorious cause; and yet it is certain that faith, although not placed among the principal causes (causas principales) of our salvation, is nevertheless termed a secondary cause (causa instrumentalis) according to the established usage approved by the apostolic writings; for without it our salvation is not possible (constat); as also our justification is not possible without faith, since justification is the imputation of Christ's merits, and this imputation takes place only through faith. Hence it is faith (because of its most noble object, Jesus Christ) without which the grace of God cannot rule (regnat) unto salvation in justification, nor have a place in predestination to produce an election unto salvation. For the grace in election and justification is identical. If the grace of God is not imputed in justification as long as Christ's obedience is not imputed through faith, then too the grace of God will remain away in election, and be useless (ociosa) to sinful man as long as there is no regard to Christ's obedience imputed by faith."—In the year 1592 the renowned Polycarp Leyser publicly and solemnly declared, together with other Lutheran theologians: "We reject the contrary doctrine, which claims either that God did not know from eternity how the children of men would conduct (verhalten) themselves toward the holy order which He Himself established for salvation, or, foreseeing that some would use this order and that the majority would despise it, that He cared nought about it and determined nothing regarding it. Both of these opinions we consider unchristian and heathenish." Several years before this, Leyser had already declared together with other theologians of Saxony: "The doctrine that teaches such a particularism, according to which God elected unto eternal life only certain particular persons directly without regarding faith, merely because it so pleased Him,—this we consider Calvinistic and unchristian."—The illustrious author of "Wachet auf, ruft uns die Stimme," and "Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern," two excellent German hymns, Philipp Nicolai (1556-1608) writes as follows against the formerly Reformed Sam. Huber, who denied every particular election of persons, also an election in view of

faith: "Since all do not obey the will of God in the gospel, the greater part of mankind resisting, and only a few finishing their course in the divine path according to the rule of the preached Word, and since the omniscient God knows all this and sees it in His infinite wisdom, therefore, it does not suffice to know only the first part of this doctrine concerning the universal compassionate will of God, but the other must also be included, concerning the foreseen difference between men . . . Moreover, from this foreseen difference between men reprobation as well as election follows. Since all do not embrace the divinely appointed means of salvation, but the greater part despises the Word, rejects faith in Christ at once or casts it away afterwards, and chooses other paths, and yet some accept the gospel fruitfully and continue in faith unto their last breath, therefore not all but only some are reprobate, because of the difference of faith and its opposite, unbelief."—And the well-known dogmatician, Leonhard Hutter (1563-1616), who is called Lutherus redivivus (Luther born again) on account of his eminent services in upholding the pure doctrine, exclaims in his Explicatio Libri Concordiæ, p. 1099: "It is a horrible blindness or instability of mind that will not recognize the same condition and relation (conditionem aut respectum) of faith in the article of election" (i. e., as in the article of justification),"especially as it is established that faith is not to be considered the source or foundation (fons sive principium) of election or of justification, but only the organ apprehending that true and only fountain of election and justification, God's gratuitous grace prepared for us in Christ." Again (p. 1103) he says: "And assuredly the treatment of faith here referred to, the opponents will not eliminate from the eternal decree of election, until they shall bring a testimony from the Scriptures that God has decreed to save men by means of causes other than He employs in time to save them; or, which amounts to the same thing, that God has one decree of elction and another decree of execution; which merely to think of God would be impious and blasphemous, inasmuch as it would make Him subject to a certain mutability." (Compare the author's "Prüfung der 'Beleuchtung' Hrn. Dr. Walthers," p. 12.)

As a result of the influence of the Philippists much vacillation ocurred at first also in the Reformed Church of Germany with reference to the doctrine of predestination. "The Leipzig Colloquium" (held in 1631 by the Lutherans, Hoe v. Hönegg, Poly-

carp Leyser, and Heinrich Höpffner of Saxony, together with several German Reformed theologians, for the purpose of securing an agreement, and to some extent at least successful) "was the last occasion exhibiting the peculiarity of the German Reformed doctrine of predestination. Over against the powerful influence exerted by the Calvinistic theology with its prominent and imposing authorities, the German Reformed Church could not preserve its individuality. Moreover, the Synod of Dort, in which nearly all the German" (Reformed) "state-churches saw themselves united with the Reformed abroad into one denomination, influenced the Reformed somewhat, as the Formula of Concord did the Lutherans. Interest in cultivating what was peculiar to separate sections of the Church by means of former relations vanished before the interest of cultivavating most carefully what was common to all and what distiguished all from the opponents of the Reformed confession. German Reformed dogmatics, therefore, embraced at once the infralapsarian mode of reasoning found in non-German theology. Yet there were always individual utterances indicating that the former had its origin in the development of German protestanism." (Compare Heppe, ibid., p. 42-79.) At the Leipzig Colloquium the Reformed theologians of Brandenburg and Hessia had made the following declaration concerning election: "God has elected from eternity in Jesus Christ from among the corrupt race of mankind not all, but some, whose number and names are known to Him alone, whom in His own time He will enlighten unto faith in Christ, through the power and operation of His Word and Spirit, renew and preserve therein till the end and finally save through faith.—Further, God has also ordained from eternity those who remain in their sins and unbelief unto eternal damnation and cast them away, not by such an absoluto decreto or mere will and counsel, as though God had ordained from eternity or created in time the greater part of the world, or some men, without regard to their sin and unbelief, unto eternal damnation or unto the cause of this damnation; on the contrary, this rejection as well as the damnation comes by a righteous judgment, the cause of which is man himself, namely his sin, impenitence and unbelief; so that the whole guilt and cause of the rejection and damnation of the unbelieving is in themselves, the entire cause, however, of the election and salvation of those believing is nothing but the pure grace of God in Jesus Christ,

agreeably to the Word of the Lord: O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help." The Lutheran theologians had given a declaration similar to that of the Reformed, viz: "In election God found no cause or occasion for such election in the elect themselves, not even a first inclination, motion, or consent unto faith, but all that is good in the elect proceeds originally from the pure and voluntary grace of God, which is given them in Christ Jesus from eternity" (—given them "vor anderen," rather than to the others, or in preference to the others was added by the Reformed and left out by the Lutherans, as they did not, like the former, make grace proceed from election in the narrower sense as its proper source, that is, from the selection of particular persons, but from election in the wider sense which embraces as its first and chief part the institution of a universal way of salvation) yet this did not prevent them from confessing likewise, as harmonizing most beautifuly with the foregoing: "God from eternity has elected those of whom He saw that in time they would believe in Christ through the power and operation of the Word and Spirit, and would persevere to the end." Also: "They furthermore consider everything that is taught in the Book of Concord concerning election correct and in harmony with the Scriptures. And God especially elected us through grace in Christ, but in such a way that He foresaw who would perseveringly and truly believe in Christ; and those of whom He foresaw that they would thus believe, He also ordained and elected unto salvation and glory." (Compare Augusti, Corpus Librorum Symbolicorum, qui in Ecclesia Reformatorum auctoritatem publicam obtinuerunt, pp. 404, sqq.)

At the Council of Dort, however, the following was set forth as the true doctrine of the Reformed Church: "The fact that God gives faith to some and not to others is due to His eternal decree; for He knows all His works from eternity, Acts15, 18; Eph. 1, 11. And in accordance with this decree He mercifully softens the hearts of the elect, though they be ever so hard (quantumvis dura), and inclines (inflectit) them unto faith; the non-elect He leaves in the just judgment of their wickedness and obduracy (duritiæ)." And the definition of election is there given thus: "Election is the immutable purpose of God, by which before the foundation of the world He elected unto salvation in Christ, according to the freest pleasure of His will, by mere grace, from out of the entire race of mankind fallen by their own fault from

their original innocence into sin and destruction, a definite number of certain individuals, neither better nor worthier than the rest, but in the same common misery with these, making Christ from eternity the mediator and head of all the elect and the foundation of salvation, etc." Furthermore it is here said: "This very election did not take place in view of faith (ex prævisa fide) and of the obedience of faith, of sanctification, or of any other good quality or disposition (dispositione) as a cause or condition demanded in advance of those who were to be elected; but it was unto faith and unto the obedience of faith and unto sanctification, etc. Consequently, election is the source of every blessing belonging to salvation, whence faith, sanctification, and the remaining gifts of salvation, and finally eternal life itself proceed as fruits and results, according to the declaration of the Apostle: 'According as He hath chosen us' (not, since we were, but) 'that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love,' Eph. 1, 4." Again: "The cause of this gracious election is God's pleasure alone, not consisting in this that He has chosen certain human qualities or actions from among all that are possible, as the condition of salvation, but in this that He has taken to be His own certain definite persons from the common multitude of sinners, as is written Rom. 9, 11-13; Acts 13, 48." And the following doctrine is rejected as false, viz.: "That God did not resolve merely according to His righteous will to leave any one in the fallen condition of Adam and in the common condition of sin and damnation, or to pass any one by in imparting the grace necessary to faith and conversion." This is said to conflict with Rom. 9, 18; Matth. 13, 11; 11, 25. 26. (Augusti. pp. 203 sqq.)

For this reason the penetrating and subtle M. Schneckenburger was certainly right when in his "Vergleichende Darstellung des reformierten und lutherischen Lehrbegriffs" (Comparison of the Lutheran and Reformed Doctrinal Conception—Stuttgart, J. B. Metzler, 1855) he sets forth the difference between the Lutheran and the Reformed doctrine of election and matters thereto pertaining, as follows: "Even in this form of doctrine" (held by some Reformed theologians) "which makes a consilium salutis (a counsel of salvation) precede the decretum prædestinationis" (and makes the former not merely, as is commonly the case with the Reformed, a means of carying out the latter), "the reference to individual persons thrusts itself into the foreground,

regard being had from eternity, and that exclusively, to them. They alone who together constitute the mystic Christ, the anointed race, are concerned in this pactum (covenant), this consilium salutis (counsel of salvation). And so strongly does the idea of subjectivity enter already into this consilium, that it is a consilium salutis only for those who will really come to possess this salus (salvation), and in no other save this real and therefore exclusive application can the Reformed idea be at all conceived. . . . . Here now the Lutheran idea differs essentially. It regards the consilium gratiæ (counsel of grace) by itself, referring it to the oblatio (offer) of salvation in Christ. Although it conceives the founding of the plan of salvation in God in a manner essentially similar to the Reformed, yet it generally proceeds more simply and provides for the realization of this salvation partly in the high-priestly office of Christ and partly in the operations of the three persons of the Godhead. God desires to remove, and that through Christ, the misery introduced by sin. This is His benevolentia, His voluntas prima or antecedens (His primary or antecedent will). By virtue of this He sends Christ, author of the reconciliation, so that they who believe on Him may be redeemed and saved. And God most earnestly wants all men to be saved through Christ. Yet He has by no means decreed that all shall be saved, but only those who believe in Christ. Only in so far as His prescience knew them already before they existed can it be said that He elected them eternally unto salvation. But this eternal election is not the principle determining the entire development of the individual and his final goal. On the contrary, the whole stress which the Reformed view, in carrying out the idea of grace, places upon the eternal pretemporal act of election, is placed by the Lutheran view upon the fact of actual universal redemption and of individual justification, upon the efficacious power of the Holy Spirit influencing man's decision. Regard is had, not so much to the two ends of the moral development of the individual, as to the living contents and course of this development; and therefore the final issue is made to depend upon the preceding development, in which the individual acts as a true moral agent, and in which grace offers true means of grace, whose use or abuse is decisive. This view, however, appears inconsistent to the mind of the Reformed, and at the same time lacking in piety, and he sets up against it his dogma of predestination." (II., p. 139 sq.) "Why now does the Lutheran fail to reach this dogma of predestination?

Does he acknowledge man's natural incapacity for receiving the divine less? No! Does he allow a wider field for human activity in the genesis of faith? No! And yet he knows nothing of an unconditional predestination and thus appears to the Reformed either as acting inconsistently or as turning halfway toward Pelagianism. Yet the Lutheran has no such need for reflecting on the causality of the new principle of faith entering into man, that he must bring this causality into systematic connection with the rest of God's objective activity for salvation. He is more satisfied with that which is immediate, and therefore feels no need of proving his salvation to himself by reflective argumentation. He indeed has the idea of predestination as an eternal divine act; yet he does not apply this idea to the genesis of faith, but to eternal salvation . . . And therefore he makes the prædestinatio, in the sense of divine foreordination,depend upon the divine prescience of persevering faith. Yet faith is also for him a pure gift of God not conditioned by anything positive in man, not even by its acceptance in so far as this is a positive action; for everything positive is already a divine gift, the reception of a divine influence. Nor can it be said that non-resistance is the absolute condition" (in the sense that this would have to be already present before grace could begin its saving work), "for the reason that non-resistance exists only where grace has broken and overcome the natural resistance; and what believer would say to himself, that he has come to believe because he did not withstand grace? and would not rather say, that he believed only because grace has taken hold of him? . . . The Reformed Christian is bound to pursue the thought of God's working back to the absolute eternal decree, feeling himself compelled to make the two opposite results, damnation and salvation, depend equally thereon; and this for the purpose, that he may secure a firm foundation for his own conviction of faith and his own consciousness of justification, obtained by reflection, and render it independent of any vacillation of inward feelings. The Lutheran is satisfied with the anthropological moral standpoint, and accordingly, when in this he looks back to God's working, he distinguishes between an activity of God positively communicating and another simply permitting. This latter, in his view, extends so far that even an annihilation of the new life implanted by faith becomes possible through man's own guilt; indeed, the highest degree of guilt consists in this, that the greatest measure of grace is exceeded by a still greater meas-

ure of wickedness." (Ibid., p. 154, sqq.)—"According to the foregoing it is clear that the Lutheran would have no occasion at all to develop a doctrine of predestination in the sense of a divine foreordination of individuals, if this were not in some way declared by the Scriptures. For the Lutheran the consilium salutis is, in general, that in which his interest concerning the eternal decrees of God concentrates; while the Reformed conceives of this consilium salutis only as connected with a predestination of individuals. Salvation in general, as a fact, is without his own especial reception of it, to his mind no complete idea. . . . Hence it is one and the same divine act, whereby Christ is appointed as the Redeemer, and whereby individuals are appointed as His own whom He has saved. And this appointment is the intelligible reason for their entire spiritual development and eternal salvation. And now in teaching a divine predestination on the basis of the Scriptures, the Lutherans make this dependent on faith, that is, on the divine prescience of faith. In this view God's free grace does not consist in this, that He gives faith and thereby a share in Christ and in eternal life according to His pleasure, but in this that He imparts to the believer, who in himself is a sinner and merits condemnation, for the sake of Christ, forgiveness and salvation. Of this grace man becomes certain in justification, and the thought of predestination is for him only an element in his assurance of salvation, wherewith he comforts himself in the battle and struggle of life. There is nothing beyond this in Lutheran dogmatics, and all further developments of this matter are only antitheses, more or less happily put, against the Reformed development. The fact that the idea of predestination is not found in the common popular consciousness of Lutherans is already a proof as to how much this idea recedes in that which is characteristic of this denomination; whereas Reformed piety nowhere reveals any life without making faith in predestination very prominent in the popular consciousness." (P. 158, sq.) —"The Reformed has the following objections to make to the Lutheran dogma referred to, viz: If faith were the condition of a predestination that were not depending alone upon itself, or upon the divine volition, then salvation, to which predestination admits, would not be a pure gift of grace . . How could God be absolute, if His foreordination were limited by His foreknowledge of man's conduct, instead of His foreknowledge being only the reflex of His own foreordination? How could the believer be sure

of his salvation, if he dared deduce his share in it as a believer only from his non-resistance as the ultimate decisive cause, and not from the irresistible grace of God? . . . Accordingly, the Reformed doctrine establishes a predestination of God unconditioned by His foreknowledge, rather conditioning this itself, producing its result with absolute, irresistible power in and with men." P. 159, sq.) —"Indeed, if the act of faith, if regeneration in which salvation and glorificatio begins to realize itself already in time, and upon which its future completion depends for the individual, is not wholly dependent on predestination, then the absolute connection between this and salvation would be annulled; not God, but man, would be the author of salvation" (according to the Reformed view). "When the act of regeneration depends absolutely upon predestination, grace must work in it irresistibly, and its result must be forever inamissible." (P. 168.) "Summing it up, the" (Reformed) "doctrine is this: In all eternity God in the unconditioned perfection of His power, and without regard to anything in man (decretum absolutum), has elected those who are to be saved, and rejected those who are to be damned, for the purpose of revealing Himself in them and upon them. To the elect alone Christ and His merit belongs, by virtue of the decretum particulare; to them alone is this merit really applied through the vocatio (particularis), which is efficacious and abiding, inamissibilis. They are saved because God has appointed them to salvation and mercifully applied all means for this purpose. The others are damned because God has appointed them to damnation, and does not work in them the conditions of salvation, but hardens them into memorials of His justice. Thus essentially an absolute difference divides the human race, corresponding to the absolutely different attributes of God, which He thus manifests" (i. e., His love and His righteousness—p. 174). "True, those Reformed teachers who originally had belonged to the Melanchthonian school in the Lutheran Church, did not express themselves so harshly concerning the second class, the reprobate, ascribing their rejection rather to their sin and unbelief. Schneckenburger, however, proves that this position is untenable for those who assume an absolute election for the first class and make their faith and salvation depend on that (p. 170 sq).—Naturally, also the Reformed theologians cannot deny that a Christian may be troubled concerning his election and salvation. We read: "The more sincere a man is the more easily this trouble

may attack him, when he sees how the fruits of the new life, which" (according to Reformed doctrine) "are real pledges of his election, are still so exceedingly deformed by sin. In this trouble there is nothing left to do but to consider the universal promises of God, to comfort the heart with its participation in the saving treasures of the Church, which unite us to Christ, and to work out our salvation with trembling." It is plain that this advice, which is continually repeated with various modifications in dogmatic and pastoral manuals, taken strictly, forsakes the basis of the dogma and is only intended to lead away from it, so as to ease and quiet the heart. For if I in advance know theoretically that the universal promises apply in reality only to certain individuals, that the treasures of salvation in the Church belong in reality only to those for whom they have been appointed from eternity, then, if I think that I have reason to doubt my election, all this can aid me but little. And it is equally hard to understand how with such doubt filling the heart salvation could possibly be worked out, which, indeed, would be done with trembling, but would also lack confidence. In fact this trouble concerning predestination becomes a heavy cross in the practical care of souls, and it is almost impossible to overcome it without forsaking the Reformed standpoint. Hence it is, indeed, remarkable and yet natural enough, that many know no other way out of the difficulty than this, that they make faith in one's own election a duty which we owe to God; or that they rest content with a minimum of desire for election, and take this as a certain sign for election, which must now be increased and strengthened by greater faithfulness." (P. 178, sq.) "The more decisively the complete consciousness of finiteness opposes the idea that God should come into immediate and present contact with us, and the more in place of this only the idea of an election of God remains, antedating time, embracing the individual, and fixing his entire development like the result of an inevitable law: so much the more must the element of justification, as an objective act of God, carried into effect through the media gratæ (means of grace), recede behind the element of eternal election, in which the vocatio, regeneratio, and justificatio are already included as nothing more than stages in the development of the individual under the influence of grace." (P. 183, sq.)—Justification "is looked upon by the Lutheran exclusively as a transcendent act, immanent in God, and intransitive, the result of which does nothing but enter the consciousness of the subject

concerned, and is received with the same faith which for the individual forms the condition for bringing this divine act to pass." (P. 45 sq.) "The actus forensis, declaring the believing sinner just by means of the imputatio of the merits of Christ, takes place at first in the divine life-circle, is, as it were, an inner-trinitarian act, the result of which, the judgment of acquittal and the adoption, are at once conferred through the Holy Spirit and the instrumenta justifications (the means of grace) to the individual. The moment in which this act with regard to the individual takes place is that in which faith in Christ springs forth in him from repentance." (P. 51.)—"The Lutheran doctrine, desiring to carry out the idea of justification by faith, goes down into the depths of the judgments and decisions immanent in God, and at once offers for acceptance by faith the result of this immanent divine action to the believing subject in an objective manner, through the mediation of the Church, wherein Christ Himself continues His office; the Reformed doctrine, on the contrary, aims rather to have that which takes place in God, the forensic judicium, mediated by a corresponding action of the subject within his own self-consciousness, and prefers to call this latter justification in the most proper sense, without strictly distinguishing it from the objective and immanent divine action, or, where this is nevertheless done, without referring the divine act in the same way to the single believing subject separately. This difference of view is related to the one treated above, stating that the man who is justified, and while he becomes justified, is, to the Reformed mind, a man already regenerated and united with Christ, while to the Lutheran mind he becomes both by this very means" (i. e., justification). (P. 63.) Again: "We have thus" (in the Reformed doctrine) "a double devine act of justification, one ideal, antidating time, one real, in the judgment of the world. If now another act of justification, taking place in time, is to intervene between these two, this can only be sought where the Mediator and Head of the elect, in whom they are chosen, appears in the history of the world. And, therefore, we find especially prevalent that form of doctrine which finds the divine declaration of the justification of believers in the resurrection of Christ." (P. 66.) "The resurrection of Christ is, therefore, really the objective execution in time of the eternal act of justification on the part of God, as the declaration of His being justified. In Christ all who are His are justified and need only to become conscious of the fact." (P. 68.)

Over against this strict Calvinism Arminianism really retained the truth of the Bible in the five propositions of its well-known Remonstrance of the year 1610; yet it erred, especially later on, more and more in Semi-Pelagian and rationalistic directions. Beside Arminianism Amyraldism or the Universalismus hypotheticus alone demands yet to be briefly mentioned as a deviation from the Reformed doctrinal conception treated above. As we have hitherto, wherever practicable, to insure objectivity and impartiality as much as possible, allowed others to speak, and that men who are authorities and had no connection whatever with the recent predestination controversy, so now we quote the words of the well-known Dr. A. Schweitzer, who is an undisputed authority in this field. He writes in Herzog's "Real-Encyclopädie," 2nd ed., Vol. I., p. 358: "Amyraldism holds fast to the real particularism, and this in such a manner that an ideal universalism is added. The chief proposition is this: 'There is a will of God desiring that all men may be saved with the condition of faith, a condition which they in themselves might fulfill, yet because of their inherited corruption unavoidably reject, so that this universal gracious will actually saves no one. Then there is a particular will in God, by which He has eternally determined to save a definite number of definite persons and to pass by all others with this grace. These elect are as infallibly saved as the others are infallibly damned'. This synthesis of a real particularism and of a merely ideal universalism which actually saves none, i. e., this addition of only an ideal universalism to the orthodox Calvinistic doctrinal system of Dort, is the peculiarity of Amyraldism. It is natural that this system should receive its name from the element peculiar to it; yet it is easy to make the mistake and think that this hypothetic universalism is hostile to the orthodox Reformed standpoint, whereas Amyraut has assured us and has proved that it may be united with the Calvinistic doctrine of Dort. The" (French Reformed) "National Synod found this innovation" (in the mode of expression) "free from all heterodoxy; Amyraut had only to say distinctly, which he gladly did, that the universal will was no predestinating decree; but only a demand and a precept: 'You all believe, and you all shall be saved'; and that as we are all corrupt, no one can be saved by this will alone . . . For further proof of his doctrine he distinguished 'objective and subjective grace': only the former, the offer of salvation under the condition of repentance and faith, is universal; the latter, the con-

verting operation of the Holy Spirit in the heart, which is to be looked upon as a moral influence, not as a blind physical motion, is indeed given only in a particular manner to the elect. And just because this decisive subjective grace, which alone really saves sinful men, is particular, therefore, objective grace can safely be made universal, as indeed Calvin himself made it."

II.

THE FORMULA OF CONCORD AND THE OLD LUTHERAN DOGMATICIANS.

The line of thought in the Formula of Concord, Article XI.: "Of God's Eternal Foreknowledge and Election", is evidently the following: The reason that this doctrine is at all treated in our last Confession is not, as in the other articles, because "public dissension, causing offense, and that is widespread," had already occured concerning it among Lutherans; but rather because the Reformed error on this point seemed to creep in also among Lutherans here and there; and, as we have already seen, these had up to this time not yet attained a uniform and unambiguous form of expression in setting forth this doctrine. Thus no actual controversy was to be settled, but the occurrance of a controversy was to be prevented by this Article XI. Moreover, the doctrine of election, "if presented from and according to the pattern of the divine Word", is of great benefit.

If, however, this doctrine is to be "presented" aright, election, in the first place, must not be confused with the foresight or the foreknowledge of God. These two are mainly distinguished in a twofold manner. They have not the same object and they are not related to their objects in the same way. They have not the same object: for the foreknowledge of God "extends to all creatures, good and bad," also to the devil and to inanimate creatures. Eternal election, however, inasmuch as it is an appointment and foreordination of certain persons unto salvation, "pertains . . . only to the children of God". These alone are elected unto eternal life, and no one else. The foreknowledge of God and His election are, moreover, not related to their objects in the same way. The former does not effect its object, and is not always pleased therewith; the latter, however, effects its object: and "is also, from the gracious will and pleasure of God in Christ Jesus, a cause which procures, works, helps and promotes what pertains thereto" (salvation), i. e. the redemption of the human race through

Christ, the preaching of the gospel, faith, and perseverence in faith, etc., so that whoever believes and is saved attains to this only by virtue of this eternal election and ordination of God.— Then, too, it is necessary for the correct "presentation" of this doctrine, that the idea of election as a cause of salvation be not made too narrow; that we understand thereby not merely what God has not revealed to us in detailed contents, i. e. His eternal foreknowledge and foreordination of the individual persons who will infallibly be saved. This, indeed, belongs to election; but it is not its only, not even its chief part. If a different view is taken, if election is restricted to the foreknowledge and foreordination of individual persons unto the infallible attainment of salvation, then "strange, dangerous, and pernicious thoughts, which occasion and strengthen either security and impenitence or despondency and despair", will follow. And "it is without doubt in no way the sound sense or right use of the doctrine concerning the eternal foreknowledge of God that thereby either impenitence or despair should be occasioned or strengthened."

When then, do we "think and speak correctly and profitably concerning the eternal election, or the predestination and foreordination of the children of God to eternal life"? When we "take together" "the entire doctrine concerning the purpose, counsel, will and ordination of God pertaining to our redemption, call, justification, and salvation", according to the example of Paul, Rom. 8 and Eph. 1, and of Christ, Matth. 22; in other words: when the eternal institution or determination of the universal way of salvation is made the first and chief part of predestination, from which the second part, the election and foreordination of individual persons unto the infallible attainment of salvation, mediated by the omniscience or prescience of God, follows of itself. The eight points which the Confession (Jacobs' Transl., p. 652 sq.) names as that which "God in His purpose and counsel decreed," are nothing but a brief statement of the chief parts of the way of salvation established for all men without distinction. This the whole connection, as briefly stated above, proves and also the entire manner of expression. This is established especially by point 1, in which the redemption and the reconciliation of the human race, or of all men, is set forth as a part of the purpose and counsel of God or of His election. It is also proven by point 7, in which preservation in faith is made dependent on man's conduct toward saving grace. And point 8, in which "those whom

He has elected" are spoken of, does not contradict this; for these eight points are, as it were, the ladder leading up from the redemption of all men to the salvation of those who embrace this redemption in persevering faith. Whoever does this is one of the elect. The universal counsel of salvation comes to a climax in the eternal decree that those who permit themselves to be conducted as far as point 7 shall be infallibly saved. These redeemed and called persons, and these alone, are also the elect. And since election by means of omniscience is an eternal act of God, while the calling and justification follow in time, therefore the former is mentioned in point 8 before the latter.

To receive into heaven at last only those who allow themselves to be led to the end of the way of salvation, chosen and established in eternity for all without exception, through the grace of God destined for all and sufficient for all, yet working irresistibly in none—this is, therefore, the last resolution of God, as it were the summit of the universal way of salvation. For this way of salvation is, as the 8 points show, conditional, i. e., a way upon which man must permit himself to be led, if he would be saved, and a way upon which no one is led with irresistible force. And if God were not omniscient, if all men had not been present before Him from all eternity with all that they did and left undone, their thoughts and words and deeds spread out like an open book before Him, then, He might indeed have established the universal way of salvation with its last decree, restricting the infallible attainment of salvation to those who persevere in faith; yet He could not have chosen and foreordained the particular individual persons. Then election would embrace nothing but the eternal institution or determination of the universal way of salvation. But since God is omniscient, election contains more, namely the eternal selection of those particular persons who will infallibly be saved. For God does nothing in time which He has not in eternity determined to do. But in time He does not permit all men, but only a part of them, and that a particular part to enter through a blessed death into eternal life; consequently, He has resolved to do this in eternity. And therefore, if we would treat election in a complete way, we must also include the eternal choice of particular individual persons unto the infallible attainment of salvation. And therefore our Confession speaks of them, but only in an addition and appendix to the eight points. For these eight points or the eternal institution of the universal order

of salvation is the great essential thing for us, is that part of election upon which everything else rests as upon an immovable foundation, from which everything else, also the choice of individual persons, flows as from its all-inclusive source. The source is primary; the choice, secondary. The former is fully revealed in God's Word. Concerning the latter we know only that it is a fact, and according to what rule it took place, and what kind of persons those are whom it embraces. And moreover these last two points we know only from the former. Who the elect persons are individually, we do not know; for God in His wisdom has not revealed it to us. That the choice of persons is full of comfort for us is due only to the fact that it is a necessary result of the provisions of the universal order of salvation; if this choice were something else, standing independently beside or above the order of salvation, it could offer no true comfort. The universal order of salvation with its grace appointed for all, sufficient for the conversion and salvation of all, although working irresistibly in none, is the source of all comfort for sinful men. Consequently, that choice of persons which rests upon this order is also full of comfort. For it cannot but be comforting to have the joyous certainty, that the omniscient God knew me already in eternity as one continuing through His grace and strength in the only way of salvation; and that He therefore also embraced me already in eternity as His child with especial love, and resolved to make all things, joy as well as sorrow, work together for good to me, and to save me eternally in spite of all devils.

The Formula of Concord does not include merely this addition and appendix to the eight points, the eternal choice of particular individual persons unto the infallible attainment of salvation, in the term election, but also the eight points themselves or the eternal institution of the universal way of salvation, and these as the chief part. This the Confession itself states in unmistakable terms, not only before enumerating the points referred to, but also after stating them. It says: "All this, according to the Scriptures, is comprised in the doctrine concerning the eternal election of God to adoption and eternal salvation, and should be comprised with it, and not omitted, when we speak of God's purpose, predestination, election, and ordination to salvation." It cannot be stated more forcibly and distinctly, that the Confession most certainly takes the eight points as belonging to the very idea of election, viewing them as a part of the eternal decrees of

God that constitute election; and that it does not treat them merely as something that must indeed also be considered in speaking correctly of the election which consists of something entirely different, nor treat them as merely the way in which God would save the elect chosen according to an altogether unknown rule not to be derived with any certainty from the universal order of salvation.

The question: "How can we know whence, and whereby can we decide, who are the elect by whom this doctrine can and should be received for comfort?" the Confession then answers by stating that, according to the will of God revealed in His Word, that person is among the elect who follows the general call through God's help and grace, who believes in Jesus Christ, and does not turn away from Christ, which he may refrain from doing through the grace offered to every one. That, if therefore I am not one of the elect, this is not due to a hidden decree of God standing beside or above universal grace, but entirely due to myself, i. e. to my wicked and obstinate resistance against the universal and all-sufficient grace whose right use, rendered possible by this grace itself, would place me also among the elect. (Jacobs' Transl. p. 653 sq., § 25-33.) For the fact "that many are called and few are chosen" is not owing to a secret will of God standing apart from or above the Word of God and deciding our salvation, whereby the means of grace as such would lose their power; but it is because God has instituted an order of salvation according to which alone He saves, brings unto faith, and keeps in faith, and because of the wilful and obstinate resistance of most men to this order, whereby they "foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in them." And thus the divinely-foreseen difference in the conduct of men toward the Holy Spirit, who works through the means of grace for their conversion and salvation, forms the explanation of the fact that, although many are called, yet only few are chosen. (Jacobs' Transl. p. 655-657, § 34-42; compare p. 526, § 12.)

Looked at it in this, the only correct way, the doctrine of predestination is "a very useful, salutary, consolatory doctrine," because it gives to God alone the honor of being the meritorious and efficacious cause of our salvation, and takes this honor from us altogether, founding our salvation wholly upon God's eternal and almighty, although not irresistible, grace; which, if only we do not wilfully turn from it, will lead us to the glorious goal in spite

of our flesh and all our foes, and will make all things work together for our good. This doctrine, that God has chosen and instituted such a way of salvation for us,— a way upon which it is not merely possible for all without exception to be saved, but upon which some are constantly saved in reality—affords also this consolation, that the enemies of the Church will never succeed in destroying the Church, and makes it plain "what is the true Church of God," namely that Church which teaches this way of salvation in purity and without adulteration. And the circumstance that the Confession counts among the blessings of this doctrine the fact, that "also powerful admonitions and warnings" are derived from it, proves strikingly that for the Confession the (eternal) choice of persons who will infallibly be saved did not take place without regard to the (foreseen) conduct of man toward the means of grace and the Holy Spirit working through them. For what "powerful admonitions and warnings" could be found in a doctrine which makes the choice of persons take place without such regard? (Jacobs' Tr., p. 657, 658, §. 43-51.)

It is true, there are also mysteries in predestination. But these, as can be seen from what has been set forth so far, do not consist in this, that we do not know from what premises the election results, or according to what rule it has taken place. They consist rather in this, that we do not know for one thing, what God in His omniscience knew already in eternity, namely which particular persons are the elect; and for another, according to what rule and order God permits His universal and all-sufficient grace to come to certain people and nations and lands in the Word and Sacraments, and even strengthens His universal, all-sufficient grace (gratia sufficiens), making it an especial, stronger grace (gratia amplior). This we must take as something beyond our comprehension and submit to God's Word, according to which "the entire Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, direct all men to Christ, as the Book of Life, in which they should seek the eternal election of the Father," so that according to this the possibility is given in Christ for every man without exception to become one of the elect, and election depends only on this, that it or eternal salvation be sought through faith in Christ. For "in Him we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who, in His eternal divine counsel, determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him." This decree is the chief part of election, that part about

which alone we are to be concerned, and according to which we are to conduct ourselves: something that we all are able to do through the grace and strength of the Holy Spirit, who is active for our conversion and salvation through the means of grace. (Jacobs' Tr. p. 658-662, § 52-75; compare p. 527, §. 13. 14.) For the drawing of the Father, without which no one can come to Christ, does not take place outside of and apart from the means of grace appointed for all and efficacious for all alike, but it takes place through these very means. And if a man come not to Christ, be not converted and saved, it is entirely the fault of the wilful and obstinate resistance, which he could refrain from by means of the strength of the grace working upon him; it is not God's fault. And also the obduracy, of which the Holy Scriptures speak, for instance in the case of Pharaoh is always a result not of the natural resistance which no man can refrain from, as long as he is on earth and lives in this sinful flesh—for then no man could be converted and saved,— but a result of the wilful and obstinate resistance which all may refrain from when converting and saving grace operates upon them. (Jacobs' Tr. p. 662-665, § 76-86.)

This must be the correct doctrine, for it answers to the test given in the start, namely, ascribes all glory to God, finding the entire cause of our election and salvation, whether it be the meritorious or the efficacious cause, in Him alone, and giving no man reason to despair or grow secure (Jacobs' Tr. p. 665 sq.), as already set forth above.

The attentive reader will have found that the line of thought in Article XI. of the Formula of Concord, just set forth, is permeated with the view that the chief part of predestination, as set forth by our Confession, is not the choice of particular individual persons unto the infallible attainment of salvation, but the institution or determination of the universal way of salvation. And that we do not put something foreign into the Confession with this assertion, but only interpret it correctly, is proven not only by a close and unprejudiced examination of the Confession itself, but also by a comparison of other expressions of the real author of its Article XI., Martin Chemnitz, on this point. In his Examen Concilii Tridentini he says, for instance, (de fide justificante III., 23, edit. Berolin., p. 197): "The doctrine of predestination places before us decrees formed by God and revealed in His Word, concerning the causes and the manner of salvation and condemnation. Such

are 1) God's decree to redeem the human race through the obedience and suffering of the Mediator, Christ; 2) The decree, to call unto salvation Jews as well as gentiles" (i. e. all men) "by means of preaching that they may partake of Christ's merits; 3) The decree of God, that He will work in the hearts of men through His Spirit by means of the Word heard; 4) The decree of God, that He will justify and save those who, when they feel their sin and the wrath of God, flee by faith to the throne of grace and embrace the Mediator, Christ, offered in the promises of the Gospel, but that He will damn those who reject His Word and despise and refuse to receive the promise. This is the sum and the analysis of the doctrine of predestination, as it is revealed in the Word."

A blind man can see that these four decrees contain nothing but the institution of the way of salvation for all men without exception, and likewise, that they have precisely the same contents as the eight points of the Formula of Concord. But the institution of the way of salvation is the chief thing in predestination for Chemnitz to such an extent, that he here does not even put in the addition and appendix concerning the choice of particular individual persons, found in the Formula of Concord, and yet declares, that he has described predestination in its entirety and in its single parts. In the same way he expresses himself in his sermon on the 20th Sunday after Trinity ("Postille" II., p. 551) and in the Confession of the city of Braunschweig in the year 1570, which he at least helped to compose ("Predestination embraces totum decretum redemptionis, vocationis, justificationis, gubernationis et glorificationis": i. e. the entire counsel of redemption, vocation, justification, government, and glorification). In his Enchiridion or manual, in which "the chief parts of Christian doctrine" are treated for the instruction of the pastors in the churches of the principality of Braunschweig, he published in the year 1574, scarcely three years before the completion of the Formula of Concord then already planned, an article concerning predestination, according to which Article XI. of the Formula of Concord is evidently worked out, and with which this article agrees in part verbatim. Here he gives the same eight points found in the Formula of Concord, only in a somewhat more extended shape, after the following preface: "Whoever would speak and think correctly, according to the Scriptures, of the counsel, predestination, election or ordination of God unto salvation must embrace these things as contained therein, and thus he will judge in the

matter with simplicity." The form, however, of the eight points in the Enchiridion is such that even the plainest man must see, that they state the way of salvation as appointed for all men as such, a universal way, not merely or even chiefly as the way of salvation for the elect. Thus the first point reads: "Since God has foreseen the fall of the human race and all that would result therefrom, He decreed and ordained in His counsel in great love and pure mercy that, and in what manner, He would save the human race through Christ." The eighth point, viz: "That God would save in eternal life and glorify (Rom. 8,) those whom He has called and justified, if they should persevere unto the end, Matth. 24, i. e. if they should hold fast what they began, their confidence and the glorying of the hope firm unto the end, Heb. 3." Immediately after this eighth point Chemnitz continues in his Enchiridion: "All this, according to the Scriptures, is embraced and meant and must be understood, when we speak of the purpose, predestination, election or ordination of God unto salvation." And this he says before he has uttered a single word on the choice of particular individual persons. He could hardly have stated more distinctly that also in this article of his Enchiridion the chief thing in predestination was for him the institution of the universal way of salvation; the one thing to which every other is subordinated, from which every other, also the choice of persons, proceeds as from its source. He then, according to the words quoted last, for the sake of completeness, speaks also of the choice. The entire form of expression, however, shows that he looks upon this choice as included in the universal way of salvation, as naturally proceeding from it, and not in the least as resting upon a hidden decree of God placed beside or above this way of salvation and separated from it, even for our enligthened understanding, by a deep gulf. For these are his words: "Is then God's eternal predestination directed only to the matter of salvation, and not also to the persons who are to be saved? In this article the Scriptures always include also the persons of the elect; for it is not that God simply prepared salvation in general, and that the persons who desire to be saved must and can seek to attain this salvation for themselves, with their own powers and abilities. On the contrary, God in His eternal counsel, according to His merciful purpose, has considered, foreseen, and elected unto salvation each and every person of the elect who is to be saved through Christ, and has also ordained in what manner He would bring them thereto, further

and keep them by His grace, gifts, and operation." (Compare the author's "Prüfung der 'Beleuchtung' Hrn. Dr. Walther's", p. 14 sqq.; also "Zeitblätter", Vol. I. May number, p. 185 sqq.)

It is self-evident that election thus understood, as being for the main part the eternal institution of the order of salvation, could be called by Chemnitz as well as by the Confession "a cause" of our salvation and of everything pertaining thereto, also of our faith and our justification. For we owe to this election the sending of the Son of God into our flesh, His vicarious life, suffering, and death, the entire work of the Holy Spirit for our salvation. All this is only the execution in time of God's decrees formed for the redemption and beatification of men in eternity, and in their entirety constituting predestination in the sense of Chemnitz and of our Confession.

But is not the doctrine of our old Lutheran dogmaticians in direct opposition to this, who, following Jacob Andreæ, beside Chemnitz the chief author of the Formula of Concord,* call faith a cause of election? If the dogmaticians had spoken of election in the very same sense as Chemnitz and the Confession, that is, of the same eternal decrees of God which these two call a cause of our faith, and had called faith the cause of these decrees, then indeed there would be an irreconcilable contradiction between them, But this is not the case, as is easily demonstrated.

Take for instance B. Baier, whose Compendium Theologiæ positivæ is used, as far as we know, to the present day as the basis for dogmatical instruction in the St. Louis Seminary. He says (Part III. Cap. XII. § 2.): "The words predestination and election are used to denote at one time the decree concerning the entire work of leading men to salvation; at another, especially the decree concerning the certain salvation of certain persons known in a certain respect (sub certa ratione) to the divine intellect." In regard to the first decree he says further: "And this is the wider signification of the words, in which God's entire

---

*When the Reformed theologian Beza raised the objection: "It is false that foreseen faith is the cause of predestination or of the elect, for this is the doctrine of Pelagius," he answered: "Faith in Christ is not a work of nature or of our human powers, but the work of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, when we teach that faith in Christ is the cause of the eternal election of God unto adoption, it is by no means related to the Pelagian heresy; for the Pelagians attributed to human powers what the Holy Spirit alone can produce and work."

process so to speak, in the work of salvation which was to take place in time, is considered (concipitur) as decreed from eternity; and in this way predestination or the actual election of God is said to procure the salvation of God's children and to dispose all things pertaining thereto. See the Formula of Concord, Art. XI." The same dogmatician also quotes B. G. Cundisius, who says as follows: "The word predestination is taken either in the wider or in the stricter sense. When taken in the wider sense, it comprehends the entire apparatus of the means of salvation; in this sense the Formula of Concord uses this word in the Sol. Declar. Art. XI. Taken in the stricter sense, this word signifies only the ordination of believers unto salvation according to the purpose of God." And Baier adds: "The same stricter use is also recognized by Balth. Meisner, when he writes: 'In the first place God has appointed the means (of salvation) for all; but because all did not accept them, therefore He has not elected all. And therefore the decree as to the means is in its order prior to the decree of the election" (of persons), "and therefore the merit of Christ, apprehended by faith and considered from eternity, is not the means" (for the carrying out) "of the decree" (of election), "but its cause'."

In the same way does J. Fr. Koenig (1619-1664) express himself in his Theologia positiva (page 113 sq.): "Taken in its good meaning this word (predestination) is understood by the orthodox either in its wider signification, inasmuch as it embraces all that belongs to redemption, vocation, justification, and salvation, as it is taken in the Formula of Concord, Art. XI.; or in its narrower signification, inasmuch as it designates together with purpose and foreknowledge the ordination of believers unto salvation, as our teachers are to be understood, who say that faith belongs to election (fidem electionem ingredi); or in its narrowest signification, for foreordination merely, as distinguished from purpose and foreknowledge, in which signification election does not include faith, but presupposes it, as it has taken place in view of faith, this being prior in order."

Ægidius Hunnius (1550-1603) writes in his Refutatio Thesium Tossani (fol. e. 4 sq.): "And that the Christian reader may comprehend the matter more easily, it must be held fast that in regard to the different objects, namely the persons and the things with which this eternal purpose of God is concerned, there are evidently, as it were, two parts of this purpose. One is the election (electio), which regards the persons to be chosen; the other

the ordination of means. Because these persons, by nature sinful and subject to the divine wrath, could not for the cause already mentioned" (the holiness and righteousness of God) "be forthwith and unconditionally (absolute) chosen, God in His counsel appointed an order of means, through which He might renew these persons, and lead them to the goal (finis) of election. Thus, in regard to the election of those who are to be saved, Christ with His merit, suffering, and obedience stands throughout as the cause in the very decree of election itself, although His suffering and death must be regarded as the effect, when considered with reference to the ordination and institution of means, for the reason that even the death of Christ itself belongs to these means for the designed restoration. Thus faith also is indeed a result of the eternal ordination of means, and in this regard subsequent to the vocation and proceeding from it in time. And yet faith, by virtue of its saving relation to the object always connected with it (correlatum suum), viz: Christ, stands at the same time with this object in relation to the election of persons, inasmuch as God, when He chose us, regarded the suffering of His Son, to be undergone in time, as the meritorious cause, and faith as the means whereby alone the foundation of election, Christ Jesus, is embraced and His merit, wherein we are chosen, made our own and the righteousness of His obedience imputed to us for salvation. In this way then we are said to be elected in Christ, not only inasmuch as He is the originator and beginner of our salvation through the righteousness obtained for us, but also inasmuch as He is the finisher of our salvation through the righteousness imputed to us by means of faith."

The very same thing is presented by Leonhard Hutter (1563-1616). In his Explicatio Libri Concordiæ we read among other matters (p. 1108 sq.): "We have stated above that God's eternal purpose refers to two different objects, one of persons, another of things, and that according to these two objects there are also two parts in the decree of election, of which one is called election" (in the narrower sense) "referring to the person to be elected; the other is called the ordination or appointment of means (ordinatio mediorum). Yet these two parts, though distinct, are not to be torn asunder; They unite in constituting the decree of election. Although the means belonging to this order follow each other in their course, and one flows from the other as effect from cause, and in such manner that the effect of the divine vocation appears

to be the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments; and on the other hand faith depends on the Word and the Sacraments as an effect upon its cause; yet if this order be regarded in the mind of God who elects, it must clearly appear that the assertion of our opponents is false, when they simply assert that neither the vocation nor the election depends on faith (esse ex fide). For sinful man could not be elected unconditionally (absolute), without first satisfying the divine justice completely; and therefore God already in all eternity ordained certain means through which He would not only save sinful man, but also lead him unto salvation, that is unto the goal of election. These means, however, are none other than Christ, considered with regard to His merits, and faith apprehending this merit of Christ, the Savior. Accordingly, these means, being considered now with regard to election, now with regard to the order, attain a double relation, one of cause, and one of effect. For Christ attains with respect to the election of the persons to be saved the relation of cause, since without the merit of Christ no mortal can be elected unto salvation. Yet again this merit of Christ, if referred to the order of the means of salvation, attains the relation of effect, because this very merit of Christ is one of these means for the realization of election. Similarly, faith, which also belongs to the order of means, is an effect of this order of means, and in this respect subsequent to the vocation, and subsequent also to the preaching of the Word and the use of the Sacraments. But inasmuch as faith sustains a saving relation to its correlative, Christ, and thus enters the election of a person, it certainly also attains the relation of cause, although not that of a meritorious or efficient, but of an instrumental cause."

Hieronymus Kromayer (1610-1670) in his Theologia positivo-polemica (p. 388) replies to those who set over against the doctrine of election in view of faith "the authority of Luther, who says in his preface to the Epistle to the Romans that faith flows from predestination", as follows: "We distinguish between a predestination of persons and a predestination of means. When Luther says that faith flows from predestination, he understands the predestination of means", i. e. that which we have above called the eternal institution of the universal way of salvation. (Compare "Zeitblätter", Vol. I., p. 154 sqq.)

The apparent contradiction between our old Lutheran dogmaticians on the one hand and the Formula of Concord and

Chemnitz and perhaps also Luther, at least the later Luther, on the other hand, is removed very readily by noting the fact that for the sake of a more accurate dogmatical elucidation the former treated the second part of predestination in the sense of the latter, viz. the election of certain persons unto the infallible attainment of salvation by itself, and called it predestination (in the narrower sense). Whether they did well in thus using a terminology different from the Confession, a terminology which, as the recent predestination controversy has shown, could produce confusion, this is a question concerning which a difference of opinion is possible among faithful Lutherans. Yet it is impossible, taking an unprejudiced view of the matter, to detect the slightest difference in the doctrine itself between the dogmaticians and the Confession. As the difference between the Lutheran and the Reformed spirit grew clearer and distincter, the dogmaticians were compelled to develop and establish one point of the Confession more extensively, and this they did, as the line of thought in the Confession itself has shown us, entirely in the spirit of this Confession. For the essential thought of our dogmaticians is precisely that of the Confession, namely, that the election of particular individual persons who will infallibly attain salvation, follows as a matter of course from the eternal institution of the universal way of salvation, by virtue of the omniscience of God; as also the so-called Syllogismus praedestinatorius of the dogmaticians concisely states it: the so-called major (viz: "He who perseveringly believes in Christ shall be infallibly saved") is nothing but the eighth point of the Formula of Concord; and in so far a brief summary of the entire eight points, or of the universal order of salvation itself.

III.

THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

A. BEFORE THE YEAR 1877.

Dr. Walther, as is generally known, was the theological leader of the Missouri Synod, and this in a way in which a single man has seldom been the leader of a religious body. Whatever he said, wrote, did, or approved in religious matters was looked upon, unless he himself modified or retracted it (and this was rare) in the Synod and accordingly also outside of it, as if the Synod itself had said, written, done, or approved it. When, therefore, we want to discuss the doctrine of predestination in the Missouri Synod, we need not confine ourselves in our statements and proofs to the official utterances of this body. In fact there are no such utterances for the period to which we here wish to draw attention. With one single exception we shall here base our discussion on the periodicals of the Synod, edited by Dr. Walther. Whatever appeared in these periodicals without a dissenting or correcting remark from Dr. Walther, was considered, according to the principle uttered repeatedly by himself and acknowledged by the Synod, as stamped by him with the seal of orthodoxy; and it must therefore be looked upon as the doctrine of the Missouri Synod at the time. Prefacing these remarks, which may be necessary especially for younger readers, we proceed to the discussion of the doctrine of predestination in the Missouri Synod prior to the year 1877. This year forms the distinct line of division between the earlier and the later doctrine of Missouri on predestination.

In April of the year 1847 the Missouri Synod was founded by Dr. Walther, Dr. Sihler, Rev. Wyneken, and others; and the "Lutheraner," published already by Dr. Walther since September, 1844, was made the organ of the new synodical body. This paper, in the 24th number of its 2d vol., July 25, 1846, in an article by Rev. Schieferdecker, entitled: "The Apostolic Symbol and Its

Varying Interpretations," had already branded the following as false Reformed doctrine, viz: That God "by an absolute decree has elected some to life and condemned others to death, in which decree man's conduct (Verhalten) has found no consideration whatever, nor also faith; for not sin and unbelief are the true causes of reprobation, if the truth of the Scriptures is to remain inviolate, but the good pleasure of God and His freest will."

In the beginning of the year 1855 appeared the first number of "Lehre und Wehre," the theological organ of the Missouri Synod, also edited by Dr. Walther. Already the first volume brought (p. 234 sqq.) "Nineteen theses on the doctrine of the eternal foreordination and the merciful election unto eternal life" as "contributed by Prof. Sihler, Ph.D." We would draw attention especially to the following theses:

"Thesis 1. Predestination is that act of God in which, before the foundation of the world, thus from all eternity, He determined, according to the purpose of His will, to save eternally, for Christ's sake and for the praise of His glorious grace, all those whose persevering faith in Christ He has foreseen. Eph. 1, 4-6; 2 Tim. 1, 9."

"Thesis 3. This gracious decree of God unto salvation is not absolute, nor does it originate in the hidden and concealed depths of the divine will, but it includes at once all causes, means, and ways for eternal salvation, and is set in a definite order, outside of which it is not to be realized, nor can it be realized in man."

"Thesis 10. Foreseen faith is not the cause of election; for we are elected not because of faith, but because of Christ."

"Thesis 11. Although all men are redeemed because of Christ (or in Christ), according to His work and merit, yet only those are elected who embrace and apprehend Him in true faith and finally persevere therein."

"Thesis 12. Just as little (see Thesis 10) is election simply the cause of faith, which is evinced by the final fall of temporary believers; faith, however, depends on election as that which is ordained upon that which ordains, and is a member of the order (see Thesis 4) in which God offers the blessing of election unto men." According to this, election, which is possible and in so far exists for every man, depends on man permitting himself to be led according to the "divine order unto blessedness and salvation," which, according to Thesis 4, is for all men.

In the 2d Vol. of "Lehre und Wehre," p. 305, we have the

beginning of a long dissertation by Rev. O. Fürbringer, entitled: "Concerning the Doctrine of Election and Several Matters Thereto Pertaining," from which we quote the following important passages: "Dark and mysterious are the depths of evil in human nature, when they come in conflict with the divine workings of the Word. There is then woven and formed, by manifold heavy guilt known only to God, a disposition in the innermost heart which, instead of grace and forgiveness, challenges the divine justice and punishment" (p. 314). "Before all time God has resolved to save man, lost and condemned through the fall, in Jesus Christ, His Son, and since it was not hidden from Him, whose eye beheld us before He had formed us, who among men would recognize His Savior and truly believe in Him to the end, He resolved to put these into that condition in which His gracious will would glorify itself in them. But if God (who resolved to do this and would therefore impart it) foreknew these as creatures who through faith would be saved, then He thereby at the same time predestinated them unto all things necessary for the attainment of salvation, as persons who will not be rejected, in whom the decree of salvation is realized" (p. 315—here the election of persons is made dependent on the foreknowledge of God or upon His "foreseeing"). "Is God's eternal election the cause of salvation for His believers in the sense that it first of all works faith? It must be held fast above all else that election is in the first place neither the foundation, nor the means, nor the condition of salvation; for these are Christ, His Gospel, and the faith given thereby. In the second place, election is not the cause of our faith, in so far as faith would be the effect of election; for the Word works faith. But since God's election appoints and ordains those whom He knows as His own in advance unto salvation, it is indeed the cause effecting their salvation in so far, as it makes all things during this time of grace adapt themselves to this end alone. It brings about that foreseen faith and all that proceeds from it is realized through the Word coming to us and felt effectively by all who hear it. This is the point of difference, dividing the pure doctrine from the Reformed particularistic doctrine, viz: That the power of the divine Word unto conversion and regeneration has not predestination as its presupposition." (P. 321.) "That many harden themselves more and more is, as a clear consequence, not a natural necessity, but an accidental effect of the Word, which always aims only at sancti-

fication and salvation; this hardening has its basis in the constitution and state of human hearts, which by nature have an evil will. In their original depravity they are therefore equally capable and equally incapable of that which is spoken by the Holy Spirit, i. e., they are dead in tresspasses and sins. Only the constantly continued resistance of one upheld by His almighty hand, a resistance against the working activity of the Gospel, contrary to the inward better conviction of conscience, called out by hearing and as often as hearing takes place—only this has as its inevitable result the development of the sinful free-will power and the curse of being cast away." (P. 322.) "From the purpose to save only those who persevere in faith, it (i. e. the Formula of Concord) here derives their election. But this conjunction of the two can be conceived only as mediated by foresight, inasmuch as God, who desires by all means to communicate his salvation, yet only on condition of persevering faith, restricts His counsel of salvation to this alone, and ordains all thereto of whom He foresaw this faith and thereby foresaw salvation, because His purpose cannot and will not fail; for a blind predestination, unenlightened by knowledge, is unknown to the Confession. And thus the strictly Lutheran Leonhard Hutter, who speaks in his Compend for the most part in the words of the Symbolic Books, and not in the least contradicting them, teaches as follows (ed. Lpz., p. 332, sq.): Christus in decreto electionis consideratur non tantum ut universalis mediator, sed et quatenus ipse ab hominibus fide actu apprehenditur, etc. Quæst. 27: Ergone statuis, Deum respectu prævisæ fidei elegisse homines? Quidni statuerem, quum scriptura sacra hoc dilucidissime affirmet? Thesis 1. Deus æterno suo consilio decrevit, quod præter eos, qui fiilium ejus Jesum Christum vera fide agnoscunt, neminem velit salvum facere. Ergo: thesis 2. Deus eligit hominem ad salutem respectu fidei prævisæ." (Christ is considered in the decree of election not only as the universal Mediator, but also inasmuch as He is actually apprehended of men by faith, etc. Question 27: Do you therefore teach that God elected men with regard to foreseen faith? Why should I not teach this, when the Sacred Scriptures affirm this most lucidly? Thesis 1: God decreed in His eternal counsel that outside of those who know His Son Jesus Christ in true faith, He would save none. Consequently, thesis 2 reads: God elected man to salvation with regard to foreseen faith.) "Note under his dicta probantia, especially John 17, 20; 2 Thess. 2, 13; James 2, 5.

The simplest dogmatic statements followed for him: Forma electionis Dei in prothesis, prognosi et proorismo consistit: prothesis, propositum, est voluntas Dei, ut, quicunque credit in Filium (sc. perseveranter s. ad finem usque), habeat vitam in æternum; prognosis, præscientia, est, qua ab æterno prævidit singula individua in Christum (sic) creditura; proorismus, ipsa prædestinatio, qua iisdem dedit vitam æsternam—electio facta est secundum Dei propositum et præscientiam simul." (The essence of God's election consists in His purpose, foreknowledge, and foreordination. The purpose is the will of God that whoever believes in His Son (i. e. perseveringly or unto the end) shall have eternal life. Foreknowledge consists in that from eternity He foresaw the single individuals who would believe in Christ. Foreordination, predestination itself, consists in this that He has given them eternal life.—Election has taken place according to God's purpose and foreknowledge simultaneously.) "Compare Eph. 1, 5. 9 with 1 Peter 1, 1, 2." (P. 324 sq.) "Surely, the purpose of the Triune God concerning our salvation, although the entire human race is viewed and embraced and blessed in Christ, can be referred only to the elect in its execution, because they alone persevere unto the end, of them alone it was known before all time, them alone He created thereto, called and predestinated from eternity; so that God, proposing to save through faith (as the only possible and conceivable form of apprehension), at the same time resolved to realize this in the elect, of whom He foresaw what was still in the future; wherefore the Scriptures refer to them alone the purpose as being embraced in the wider idea of the will (compare Eph. 1, especially 11; 3, 11; Rom. 8, 22; 2 Tim. 1, 9). Yet from all this it does not follow that in its real foundation predestination dare be extended, as an eternal act of omnipotence ruling above grace and determining it absolutely, equally to foreknown condemning unbelief; so that the character of the universal decree to save mankind through the gift of faith would be injured, and knowing and willing and working would be the same thing; or that He knew only what He wills. Speculation concerning God and the mysteries of His being has nothing to do at all with the revealed way of salvation." (P. 325.) "The antecedent will, the gracious, sincere desire that none may be lost, Ezek. 18, 23, has the universality of the reconciliation of Jesus Christ and of the divine call of grace . . . as its immediate result; but since the subsequent will, John 6, 39, conditions this will by

that of the creature, not in any synergistic sense, unless a gratia irresistibilis is to be maintained, upon what then does this assurance rest, that the realization of the divine purpose can by no means be overthrown? It rests upon the eternal purpose of God to predestinate those who were foreseen in their persevering faith; as it is certain, that if God had not foreknown that not all men (and angels) would be lost, their creation would not have taken place." (P. 329.) "The theologians of Dort place the chief predestining cause of the damnation as well as of the salvation of those born now in a sinful condition, absolutely in God and in His beneplacitum absolutum" (absolute pleasure), "without basing election with the Lutherans upon the foresight of persevering faith, i. e. conditioning the former in God upon the latter." (P. 354.) "The point of view from which the matter is regarded is indeed different, when foresight is derived from foreordination in the eternal decree; and it is an abomination, when in addition blasphemous and wholly onesided conclusions are drawn. It is far more in accord with the Word of Biblical Revelation, which condescends to our human powers of apprehension, to follow in their mode of teaching the Lutheran dogmaticians, especially after the opposite type of doctrine had deteriorated into heresy and had been developed and established and accepted generally; namely, to consider knowledge apart from will, and connecting predestination with prescience, condition the former upon the latter. But all such anthropopathies must be limited by the necessary unitas et simplicitas essentiæ divinæ" (unity and simplicity of the divine essence), "which is likewise clearly taught by the Scriptures, and excludes any real contradiction within the active eternal Power itself." ("Lehre und Wehre," Vol. III., p. 18.) "We too now are . . . . certain, that we are free, i. e. that we have that which determines our will in ourselves, without experiencing either inwardly or outwardly any compulsion or determining influence in such a manner as to render the effect inevitable." (P. 23.) "Left to himself man has only the imagination of the carnal heart, a hostility to the law. Through the preaching of the law this sinfulness, although he still loves and is fettered by it, appears to him in all its terrible reality, with all its unhappy results. And by a strange contrast at the same time bitter slavish fear is the consequence. The point now upon which everything depends is the resistance of such a soul by nature in its personal desires against the spiritual influence of the Gospel and the strength of

its motives. These positively enkindle in the terrified heart, by presenting to it its true objects as originally appointed, a new desire for them, a desire which may easily become a spiritual longing and may turn the power of free choice strongly, although not with determining compulsion, toward the good with a favorable inclination. Grace in this way would break the strength of the inborn slothfulness, disinclination, and total unfitness regarding the good, and works upon the affections of man and the volition proceeding therefrom, just as does the serpent-seed of evil implanted in him. At this instant now he is free, which he was not before. If his resistance, however, especially by holding fast seductive impressions received perhaps long before and due also to what is commonly called the false wisdom of the world, is intentionally, pertinaciously, and continually renewed and thereby more and more increased, then the Holy Spirit turns away from him. . . . On the other hand, the renewal of the spiritual nature of the personality in its cognitive and voluntative powers proceeds in those who come to faith, not because God is stronger than the creature, but because He works in the stages appointed hereto from eternity, only by inclining, not by determinating, and thus calls forth man's self-determination (Selbstbestimmung) directed to the attainment of salvation, and renews the lost freedom by awakening a good will opposed to that which is natural evil. And to him who now has not assumed voluntarily the higher degree of evil will for the rejection of the good, He offers, by the same outward means and by the inner activity effective through them, gradually, and at times also rapidly, the victory in the struggle against the natural obstinacy or disinclination, and preserves this henceforth in increasing faithfulness. . . . If at first there results no decision, yet man can never be conceived as without impulses, which then act of themselves within him, if only the motives of the one or the other are strong enough. And this we have called natural resistance in distinction from the divine grace offered for overcoming these impulses and likewise working powerfully upon them. If in the hour of temptation the power of choice inclines anew to favor untruth, to keep and hold fast the evil tendency, determined not to be converted, then this is the plainest possible proof that the sinner is not stone or wood or a mere machine, nor has sunken by the fall to the level of the brute, else no Word would be needed for his conversion. His rational free will has retained the ability of withstanding the greatest meas-

ure of the spiritual gift. Compared with this activity, belonging entirely to fallen men, the incipient receptive and passive conduct of the man coming to faith, induced by the spiritual inclination of the will unto the good, is already more than an inactive indifferent wavering midway, it is already an opposition to the activity for evil; and the libertas sese convertendi" (liberty to convert oneself) "is likewise not at all dependent on the creature as such, but purely and exclusively on the power of the divine motives in the Gospel, which bring the true objects of the deepest human longing by supernatural influence, in a living, powerful, certain manner, to man's consciousness. Never now can the painful memory of our sinfulness hitherto be separated from the thought that we come short of the glory of God; and because the law and the word of promise work upon us in undivided apostolic and prophetic proclamation, never can this memory be separated from the effort to take that path which will remove this lamentable alienation. And this path is the certain confidence of the heart trusting in Him who knew no sin and was made sin and righteousness for us. Thus, indeed, the heart itself for the moment steps between a power of sinlessness on the one side, which in consequence of the reconciliation and forgiveness obtained through Christ is to become its treasure and is to occupy it, and a power of sin on the other side, which still permeates nature and would draw it out of its already changed position—steps between Christ and Belial, between the old and the new birth; but the heart is brought to this and receives this disposition by the drawing of the Father unto the Son, i. e. by the warning and convincing voice of the Holy Spirit who efficaciously offers peace to the conscience and seeks again to dwell in the heart; and this to the purpose that it may not give heed to the motives of the flesh which are weaker than the Spirit's voice—although many still give such heed—and that it may finally turn the scale by bringing the will, still wavering in both directions, to a decision. Whatever the decisions now are they mutually exclude each other. Neutrality, except in these momentary decisions, is inconceivable; for no life is possible without them. By the frequent repetition of one of these decisions the power inducing it gains control; hence it may easily happen to those brought into saving and living communion with Christ that they again lose their own stronghold, viz: the state of grace they have attained." (P. 167 sqq.) "The refractoriness of one spiritually dead can indeed never be stronger than the

power of Him who in the first place gives life to all; and most certainly not in one who has been brought by the law to a knowledge of his powerlessness and indigence, wherein it was indeed God's intention to make it easier for him not to enter in its wicked depth a purposely and wilfully nourished resistance. Yet God would not degrade his noble intellectual creature, man, and make of him a mere machine; therefore, His grace is not unfrustable as His power could indeed be. It awakens, it draws, it loosens, it renews, not with the necessity of nature, but according to the powers created in man which receive their impulse and inclination toward God through the motives supernaturally imparted by Him; so that the act of consenting is an essential result of the reception of prevenient grace, this reception being passive under the divine influence." (P. 197.) "It is impossible to escape the hand of God knocking first at the door; but when He would open it, He can permit Himself to be turned away." (P. 198.)

The reader sees from the above extracts that this article of Rev. Fürbringer enters thoroughly into nearly all the questions discussed in the present predestination controversy. If Missouri had abided by the doctrine taught in this article, which in its view and treatment of the subject agrees with the doctrine of the old Lutheran dogmaticians, the controversy on predestination and conversion, which even as yet is not ended, would never have arisen. It must be remarked that this article was published by Dr. Walther in "Lehre und Wehre" without the slightest mark of dissent or doubt, thus receiving his complete editorial approval. Nor was it disapproved later on either by the author or by Dr. Walther before the Chicago Conference in the autumn of 1880.

There are no statements or discussions concerning predestination or related matters by Dr. Walther himself in the first volumes of "Lehre und Wehre," but we have from his pen in "Lehre und Wehre" as well as in the "Lutheraner," the most unqualified recommendations of the reprinted works of our old theologians who teach distinctly the doctrine of our old dogmaticians as reproduced in Rev. Fürbringer's article. The most noteworthy instance of this sort is found in Vol. III. of "Lehre und Wehre," p. 42, etc., where Dr. Walther writes in his long article, "Lutherisch-theologische Pfarrers-Bibliothek" (Lutheran Theological Ministers' Library), as follows:

"A minister is often in need of a book to put into the hands

of his hearers, so that they may learn the difference between the Evangelical Lutheran and Reformed Churches. There are not a few works serving this purpose. The best old work of this kind is, in our judgment, "Kurzer Bericht von dem Unterschied der Wahren Evangelischen Lutherischen und der Reformierten Lehre" (Brief Account of the Difference Between the Evangelical Lutheran and the Reformed Doctrine), by Dr. Hektor Gottfried Masius, Copenhagen, 1691." (Reprinted also later, for instance in 1843 by the publisher, G. W. Niemeyer, in Hamburg.) "This little book is to be preferred to many others of its sort on account of its mild and earnest spirit of speaking the truth in love, as also on account of its clearness and thoroughness of argumentation."

And now what does Masius teach concerning predestination? Precisely what our old dogmaticians teach and, following them, what Rev. Fürbringer teaches. For instance: "God does not will man's salvation absolutely (bloss hin), but conditionally, and in the order of certain means; and because most men reject these means, can God therefore be accused of mutability?" (Chap. 2, Quest. 4, p. 41 of the Hamburg edition.) "God, according to His antecedent will, has had compasion on all men, whether they be elect or reprobate. But the fact that, according to His subsequent will He had compassion not upon all, or did not elect all, is due to this that all do not follow His antecedent will and believe in the name of the Son of God to the end." (Ibid., p. 42.) "That God has elected a few according to His mere will and pleasure without regarding faith grounded in the merit of Jesus Christ, is the regular doctrine of all those Reformed who adhere to their symbolic books and accept the decrees of the Synod of Dort. Although a few admit that election did not take place without all regard to the merit of Christ and to faith, yet they do not mean that God from eternity elected those of whom He foresaw that they would believe and accept Christ's merit, but that He elected some few according to His mere absolute will in order that they might believe in time. Hence faith is not regarded by them as a cause or condition of election, but as a necessary effect of election. See concerning this the Synod. of Dort, p. 342, 524. Molinæus says in the Synod. Dordrac. Sess. 141, p. 396, in so many words: I acknowledge no election in view of faith, whether faith be taken as a cause of election or as an antecedent condition. God did not elect us because we believe, but that we might believe. Massonius part. I, c. 42, p. 1514. Because faith is God's

gift He did not foresee it and direct His election to it." (P. 64.) This then is Reformed doctrine and assertion, which Masius rejects with the declared approval of Dr. Walther. "The following is the Lutheran doctrine according to the Scriptures, viz: That God indeed has compassion on all men; that Christ also died for all; that the means of grace, too, are offered to all men; but that God also foresaw who would believe in Christ and continue in such faith unto the end, and these He resolved to save for Christ's sake; and these are they whom the Scriptures call the elect." (P. 65 sq.) "God has elected no one from eternity save him of whom He foresaw that he would continually believe to the end. You say: But man cannot believe of himself; God must give him faith. I answer: This is true, and therefore God also gives the means of faith; but man can reject such means and resist the Holy Spirit, as is unfortunately the case with many." (P. 69.) "Although faith did not yet actually exist, still in the foresight of God it existed; hence Peter says that we are elected according to the foreknowledge of God, 1 Pet. 1, 2. As the elect themselves did not exist when God elected them before the foundation of the world was laid, thus, too, their faith did not yet exist. But they themselves as well as their faith existed to the eyes of God's foresight." (P. 71 sq.) "If we would teach that in election God looked to our works and merit as a meritorious cause, the objection" (namely, that according to Lutheran doctrine man chose Christ, in contradiction to John 15, 16) "might have some semblance of reason. But as faith is not our work nor our merit, but God's gift, therefore all the glory of election is our God's alone, who has appointed us unto adoption by grace. And as we have nothing to boast of in justification when God saves us through faith, as though we preferred ourselves, so also all our glory vanishes although God in election looked to our faith; for faith does not rest upon ourselves, but upon Christ's merits." (P. 73.)

This is what we read in a little volume which, according to Dr. Walther's unqualified recommendation, is entirely suitable to be put into the hands of church members, "so that they may learn the difference between the Evangelical Lutheran and the Reformed Churches," since it is a book characterized by "its mild and serious spirit of speaking the truth in love," and by "its clearness and thoroughness of argumentation."

In a similar manner, without the slightest qualification or exception, Dr. Walther recommended also the following works con-

taining in clear statements the doctrine of predestination held by our old dogmaticians: Lassenius, "82 Trostreden" (82 Consolatory Discourses), republished by a church member in St. Louis and "selected and arranged" by Dr. Walther himself, the "entire contents" of which are "from the pure and unadulterated Word of God" (on p. 157 of this work we read for instance: "God has also not elected us that we should believe but because He foresaw that we would believe"), and the Weimarische Bibel, in which "the reader" is said to have "an exposition through and through according to the faith, in doctrine pure as gold" (in Rom. 8, 29. and in 1 Pet. 1, 2. this Bible explains "foreknown" and "foreknowledge" by: "Foreseen that they would believe"; and 2 Thess. 2, 13: "That the Holy Spirit by the Word of the Gospel called you to Christ's kingdom, and wrought true faith in Christ in your hearts, and thereby regenerated, renewed, and sanctified you; and because God the Lord was conscious from eternity of this work of grace in you, Acts 15, 18, therefore He has also elected you from eternity in such sanctification of the Spirit and in such true faith in Christ"). In the same way Dieterich's Exposition of the Catechism, adapted by Dr. Walther himself and still used without change in the Missouri Synod in spite of the protests of honest fanatics, contains in questions 321-328, according to the form of the words, as well as according to the author's meaning, the doctrine of our old dogmaticians on predestination. For instance, question 321 reads: Election "is that act of God by which He determined according to the purpose of His will, out of pure grace and mercy in Christ, to save all those who shall perseveringly believe in Christ, for the praise of His glorious grace." Question 325: "Why is it that not all men for whom these means of salvation are appointed are equally elected to eternal life? This is because God has determined to elect them not absolutely and unconditionally, but with this condition and in this order, that they believe in Christ through the Gospel and be saved through true faith in Him. But because most men do not believe, it naturally follows that those alone who perseveringly believe in Christ, and consequently only a few, are elected." (The decisive and conclusive regard to faith in election can scarcely be expressed more tersely.) Question 326: "But whence is it that not in all faith is produced by the Gospel and they then believe in Christ? It is through their own fault, because they of their own

volition despise and reject the preached Word, and thus in a manifold way resist the operation of the Holy Spirit."

In "Einige Bemerkungen über eine neue Apologie der Reformierten Kirche" (A few remarks on a New Apology of the Reformed Church—"Lehre und Wehre," Oct., 1863) Dr. Walther expresses himself, quoting also with approbation statements of Joh. Gerhard (who, by the way, held as fast to and correctly understood an election in view of faith as did any teacher of our Church), as follows: "There is accordingly a great difference between saying God has elected those of whom He foresaw that they would believe and continue in faith, and saying: God has elected some because He foresaw that they would believe and continue in faith, or for the sake of their faith. The former is altogether correct according to Rom. 8, 29, the latter is Pelagian." (P. 300.) This, as well as a few other things in the article, sounds indeed already like a turning toward Calvinism; yet it can be accepted when the "because" is taken with Dr. Walther in the sense of "for the sake of" (um willen), in which sense, by the way, as far as we know, not one of our old dogmaticians or other theologians has taken it. Evidently, however, Dr. Walther here still understood Rom. 8, 29, as they did. At about the same time he still dictated to his students these words from Quenstedt: "False doctrine of the Calvinists who tear faith out of the decree of election and say, faith belongs to election not antecedently, but subsequently, not to the election itself, but to its execution. Those of Dort say: Election is not out of the foresight of faith, but is unto faith."

In June of the year 1868 the Northern District of the Missouri Synod was assembled in Milwaukee, and Dr. Walther was also present, being at the time President of the entire Synod, and of course, as always, the real leader, especially in the doctrinal discussions. "Twenty.four Theses concerning the doctrine of good works on the basis of the doctrine of free will, election and justification" were presented by Rev. J. A. Hügli, in which clearly an election unto faith was taught, and the doctrine of our old dogmaticians was judged as follows: "In God there are (fallen) no conditions; yet conditions are claimed for God when it is said that He elected in view of faith" (p. 24). "The question, in what respect it would be Pelagian to consider faith as the middle link, so that the motive in election would not be faith in itself, but Christ and His merit apprehended by faith? was answered as fol-

lows: Faith is indeed the middle link; but when it is said that God elected in view of faith, then faith is not the middle link, but a condition. And however sharply we may distinguish, a certain causality will still be ascribed to faith. But we find no statement in the Scriptures saying that we are saved for the sake of faith. Faith is a means, not a cause. Christ is the foundation of our salvation, even when He is not apprehended by faith." (P. 25.) Accordingly, the expression, "God has elected intuitu fidei, in view of faith", was declared to be an "unfortunate terminology" chosen "because of the Calvinists." Luther's book, De Servo Arbitrio, is quoted with approbation also in the doctrine of predestination, and declared to be a "glorious testimony" by the side of the Formula of Concord (p. 26), although this last Confession of our Church refrains with significant silence from mentioning at all this book of Luther in the article of predestination. This synodical Report of 1868 stands as a whole on the same plane with the Report of the Western District of 1877, which will be considered later, also as regards its unhappy attempts at separating the form of expression of our old dogmaticians from their doctrine, and at uniting this doctrine with Calvinistic views; only this Report is much briefer and therefore does not treat the subject so fully, and consequently did not produce the sensation caused by the Report of 1877. "Lehre and Wehre" then too brought an article in the October number of the same year, about three months after the synodical meeting at Milwaukee, by Dr. Sihler on the perniciousness of the Reformed doctrine of predestination, in which the writer, after the manner of our dogmaticians, made a distinction between an antecedent and a subsequent will of God, and then continued thus: "As God, however, according to the purpose of His will, out of pure grace, before the foundation of the world, resolved to save those eternally whose persevering faith in Christ He foresaw from eternity and wrought in time through the Gospel: so also, according to His righteousness, He resolved before all time to reject and condemn in eternity those whose unbelief against Christ He foresaw by virtue of His omniscience, and who in time either from the outset withstood the influence of His Holy Spirit in the Gospel by wicked unbelief, or believed only for a time and after that by wilful sin cast aside their faith and good conscience, and adhered to this rejection of Christ in opposition to all the work of convert-

ing grace." This is clearly and distinctly an election in view of faith.

At the meeting of the Northern District in the year 1871, at which Dr. Walther was not present, these theses of Rev. Hügli were again taken up. Among the "Added remarks to thesis 5" we find the following: "Election is the cause of all that takes place for the salvation of the elect; it is the cause that any one comes to repentance; it is also the cause, when one who has fallen away returns unto repentance." (P. 16.) "As far as temporary faith is concerned, it is indeed a result of the grace of God through the Word, but not of election. Election is the cause only of the faith of the elect; therefore, an elect person believes either unto the end, or, if he falls from faith, he returns to faith before his end." (P. 17.)

The declaration of the Northern District of the year 1868, quoted above, asserting that even this already is "Pelagianism" to teach, as our old dogmaticians, Hunnius, Hutter, Gerhard, etc., do outspokenly with the brief expression "in view of faith," that God elected in view of Christ's merits apprehended by faith, was finally attacked by Prof. G. Fritschel in Brobst's "Theolog. Monatshefte", Jan., 1872, and this with justice, as a "gross insult to the Lutheran Church." Dr. Walther replied to this in "Lehre und Wehre", in May of the same year, and did this in the same contemptuous, uncharitable, and unscrupulous manner in which, especially in the latter half of his life, he treated all those who persisted in their opposition to his views. In the most offensive terms he repels Prof. Fritschel's accusation as, "to say nothing worse, simply a gross perversion, an open falsehood": nothing of the kind, he claims, had been asserted! And how did he try to prove this? By referring to entirely different and correct sentences found in the same Report beside the others, as in the Report of 1877, and by referring to his own explanation, quoted above, in "Lehre und Wehre" in Oct., 1863! But he does not say explicitly whether he will withdraw, as an "inconvenient expression", the sentence especially attacked by Prof. Fritschel. It is especially important for us here, that he even then yet acknowledged that explanation of his, and added: "Our Synod confesses most positively that the theologians of our Church, also in the 17th century, taught the correct doctrine of predestination and defended it against the Calvinists; only this one thing does our Synod find fault with in the doctrinal presentation of the former on this point,

that the expression, 'God has elected intuitu fidei' is an 'unhappily chosen terminology.'" In the following numbers of "Lehre und Wehre" (July—Dec., 1872) he then, with the skillful generalship he always displayed, transferred the battle into the territory of his opponent by attacking Prof. Fritschel's assertion, which in itself may be misunderstood, which he, however, had correctly explained, viz: "The fact that in the case of two men who hear the Gospel resistance and death is taken away for the one but not for the other, finds its explanation in man's free self-determination, although this itself is first made possible by grace." (Compare Rev. Fürbringer's exposition on this point as quoted above.)

III.

THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

B. THE SYNODICAL REPORT OF THE WESTERN DISTRICT FOR THE YEAR 1877.

In the autumn of 1877 the Western District of the Missouri Synod met in Altenburg, Perry Co., Mo. The subject for the doctrinal discussion, to which beside the morning sessions two afternoon sessions were devoted, consisted of 6 theses, furnished, elaborated, and defended by Dr. Walther himself, the proposition being: "Auch in ihrer Lehre von der Gnadenwahl giebt die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche Gott allein die Ehre" (Also in the Doctrine of Election our Evangel. Lutheran Church Gives all Glory to God Alone). Five of these theses were discussed and adopted. The greater part of the time was devoted to the first three, and these are the most important also for us. The theseist says: "The language of these theses is purposely taken from the Formula of Concord, so that every one may know that no new doctrine is to be presented here, but that only the doctrine of our Confessions is to be repeated." This assertion, however, does not yet prove that the passages quoted from the Confession are correctly understood and interpreted. Indeed, all the sects cite Scripture passages in favor of their peculiar false doctrines, and yet are not able to prove thereby that their doctrine is right and scriptural.

Thesis 1 reads as follows: "It" (the Ev. Luth. Church) "teaches according to God's Word 'that God was so solicitous concerning the conversion, righteousness, and salvation of every Christian, and so faithfully provided therefor, that before the foundation of the world was laid He deliberated concerning it, and in His purpose ordained how He would bring me thereto and preserve me therein. Also, that He wished to secure my salvation so well and certainly, that, since through the weakness and wickedness of our flesh, it could easily be lost from our

hands, or through craft and might of the devil and the world be torn or removed therefrom, in His eternal purpose, which cannot fail or be overthrown, He ordained it, and placed it, for preservation in the almighty hand of our Savior Jesus Christ, from which no one can pluck us.' It also teaches that 'in His counsel, purpose, and ordination He prepared salvation not only in general, but in grace considered and chose to salvation each and every person of the elect, who shall be saved through Christ, and ordained that in the way just mentioned He would by His grace, gifts, and efficacy bring them thereto, and aid, promote, strengthen and preserve them'. (Book of Concord, Jacobs' Translation'* p. 657, §. 45, & p. 653, §. 23.) Matth. 22, 14; Eph. 1, 4. 11; Rom. 8, 28-30; 2 Thess. 2, 13."

This thesis evidently means to show what election is, what it includes and embraces. Hence, it is surprising that not the full statement of the Formula of Concord, as contained in the well-known eight points, is adopted or at least made the basis for the definition, but that two other passages torn from their connection are adduced, of which one treats of the "excellent, glorious consolation" which "this doctrine affords also", that is when accepted and treated in the sense of the Formula of Concord, and the other forms only a supplement and addition to the eight points, of which points the Confession says: "All this, according to the Scriptures, is comprised in the doctrine concerning the eternal election of God to adoption and eternal salvation, and should be comprised with it, and not omitted, when we speak of God's purpose, predestination, election and ordination to salvation" (Jacobs' Transl. p. 653, §. 24). Thus, self-evidently, the wrong foundation is laid for the entire discussion. The Confession understands much more by election than this Report, and in so far something entirely different from its conception; and when now this Report proceeds to apply to election in its (narrower) sense what the Formula of Concord applies to it in its (wider) sense, the whole result can only be confusion and error, even though in certain cases some correct things are said. This is the case already in thesis 2. The passage of the Confession it contains applies only to the election taught by the Confession, and not at all to the mutilated Missourian election. The thesis reads thus: "It teaches: 'The eternal election of God not only foresees and foreknows the salvation

---

*For Mueller's edition we substitute Jacobs' translation.

of the elect, but is also, from the gracious will and pleasure of God in Christ Jesus, a cause which procures, works, helps, and promotes what pertains thereto; upon this also our salvation is so founded that the gates of hell cannot prevail against it (Matth. 16, 18). For it is written (John 10, 28): Neither shall any man pluck my sheep out of my hand. And again (Acts 13, 48): And as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed.' (Jacobs' Transl., p. 651, §.8.) Matth. 24, 24; Acts 13, 48; Rom. 8, 33-39; Hos. 13, 9." Compare with this and also with the following what is said above, p. 39 sqq., concerning the line of thought in the Formula of Concord.

Thesis 3 reads: "It teaches that 'it is false and wrong when it is taught that not alone the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ, but also something in us is a cause of God's election, on account of which God has chosen us to eternal life' (Js'. T., p. 665, §. 88), Eph. 1, 5. 6; Rom. 9, 15; 1 Cor. 4, 7; whether this be a) man's own work or sanctification, 2 Tim. 1, 9; Tit. 3, 5; Eph. 2, 8. 9; Rom. 11, 5. 7; b) man's right use of the means of grace, Acts 16, 14; c) man's selfdetermination, Phil. 2, 13; Eph. 2, 1. 5; d) man's longing and prayer, Rom. 9, 16; e) man's non-resistance, Jer. 31,18; Is. 63, 17; f) man's faith, Rom. 4, 16." This thesis, as far as its language goes, can and must be accepted; its contents have never been denied either directly or indirectly by any Lutheran who taught an election in view of faith, since no one has held or asserted that faith, or any of the things named in the thesis, is a "cause of election" found in us, "on account of which God has chosen us to eternal life." The synodical Report, however, puts something into the words of the Confession which hitherto no faithful teacher of our Lutheran Church had found in them, namely the rejection of every decisive regard of God in election to man's foreseen faith or conduct toward the means of grace and the Holy Spirit working through them.

When now we proceed to the closer consideration of this Report, which is extremely important as regards the "History and Proper Estimate" of the "Present Controversy on Predestination", we find that in it, as in the previously considered synodical Report of the Northern District of 1868 (p. 65 sq. above), the attempt is made to maintain the doctrine of our old dogmaticians, which accords in all its essential features with the Formula of Concord, by the side of the new Calvinizing Missourian principles, although

here and there fault is found with their mode of expression. Thus that unhappy mixture of Lutheranism and Calvinism is produced which characterizes this Report. We will see later on, that in due course of events several of the Lutheran reminiscenses of this Report most glaringly in contradiction with its Calvinizing principles, were explicitly discarded. These correct propositions, appearing like discordant elements in motley mixture among the false, are due to the circumstance, that in part at least they who uttered them were not yet fully clear and sure in the new doctrine; or that they did not yet dare to come out openly; then also in part, to the fact that the St. Louis theologians, as it appeared for instance at the large Pastoral Conference at Chicago, were not agreed among themselves. (Compare the author's pamphlet: "Worum handelt es sich eigentlich in dem gegenwärtigen Lehrstreit über die Gnadenwahl?"—What is the Real Question in the Present Controversy concerning Predestination?—p. 17).

Let us look now at the principal passages in which the new Calvinizing view comes out clearly.

In the very beginning of the doctrinal discussion, p. 23, we read: "The doctrine of election concerns as it were, the very foundation (untersten Grund) of the great, unsearchable mystery of our salvation"—a genuine Calvinistic proposition, in which election is declared to be, as it were, the very foundation of salvation, namely, election in the new Missourian sense, hence, not in so far as it is above all else the institution of the universal way of salvation, but in so far as it is the mysterious election, unconditioned by any divine foreknowledge, of particular individual persons in preference to others and passing by the others. Page 24 we read of this same election: "Yes, God already from eternity has elected a certain number of men unto salvation. He has decreed, that these shall and must be saved; and as surely as God is God, so surely also these will be saved, and none but these." According to this proposition salvation depends for its essential basis solely and alone upon this secret eternal election. He who is thus elected, without any regard to his conduct over against the means of grace, shall and must be saved, and no one else will and can be saved. Page 26: "We are to learn from this" (from Eph. 1, 5) "that we are elected not according to the will of any creature, or according to our own will, but according to the will of God. This will of God, however, is also itself not determined by any other will. Therefore the apostle says: 'according to the good

pleasure of His will'. If then we would say to God: Why didst Thou not elect me? He would answer: Because I so willed. If now we were to ask further: Why then didst Thou so will? He would reply: It was simply the pleasure of my will. Indeed, God does not allow us to criticize Him. We are to know that we are in His hands. He alone created us for this temporal life; He alone, according to His mere (puren blossen) pleasure, gives us also eternal life." The saving will of God, by virtue of which He has elected a man, brings him to faith, keeps him in faith, and leads him to heaven, is, according to this, "not determined by any other will," i. e., it is carried out without any regard to the will of man. Nothing, not even the will of man, can hinder this saving will of God. Compare with this, for instance, only the one word of Christ, Matth. 23, 37: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" and the one word of our Confession in the Formula of Concord, Epitome XI. (Jacobs' Transl., p. 526, §. 12): "That, however, 'many are called, few are chosen', does not mean that God is unwilling that all should be saved, but the reason is that they either do not at all hear God's Word, but wilfully despise it, close their ears and harden their hearts, and in this manner foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in them, or, when it is heard, they consider it of no account, and do not heed it. For this not God or His election, but their wickedness, is responsible."

Page 27 sq.: (Rom.8) "Verse 29 is often interpreted incorrectly. For it is said: Here we read indeed: whom God 'did foreknow, He also did predestinate'; so then He has looked into the future and known in advance how men would conduct themselves, and has thought thus: Those of whom I see that they are pious I will save; those of whom I see that they are not pious I will cast into hell. But this would be nothing but the universal decree concerning our salvation. Then there would be no election at all. No; if we compare the Scripture passages which speak of God's knowing and recognizing His own, we see that this expression means nothing but this, that He loves them; that He has chosen, elected, received them as His own, and acknowledged them as His loved ones . . . Compare also 1 Pet. 1, 2; Rom. 11, 2; & 2 Tim. 2, 19; where throughout the word used in our passage,

γιγνώσκειν, is taken to mean to elect." Compare with the first half of this quotation for instance the following word of the Formula of Concord, Epitome XI. (Js'. T., p. 526 etc., §. 13): "Moreover, a Christian should apply himself to the article concerning the eternal election of God, so far as it has been revealed in God's Word, which presents Christ to us as the Book of Life, which, by the preaching of the holy Gospel, He opens and reveals to us, as it is written (Rom. 8, 30): 'Whom He did predestinate, them He also called'. In Him, therefore, we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who, in His eternal divine counsel, determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him." Compare also in general the line of thought in the Formula of Concord set forth on page 39 of this work, according to which the eternal institution of the universal way of salvation, or the "universal decree concerning our salvation", forms the very first and foremost part of election, and the sole part which in its contents is revealed to us men in the Gospel, and about which we are to concern ourselves. With the second half of the quotation above, as also with the first sentence of the whole passage, compare Dr. Walther's former statement, in which he declares it to be "altogether correct" to understand the word προγινώσκειν, Rom. 8, 29, thus: "God has elected those of whom He foresaw that they would believe and continue in faith," (see p. 65 above).

On page 30, 2 Thess. 2, 13. is interpreted in contradiction to the Weimar Bible as also in contradiction to other faithful teachers of our Church, thus: "We are elected unto sanctification of the Spirit and unto belief of the truth." And besides this the attempt is made to refute the opposite and regular Lutheran interpretation, which adheres to the precise words of the Holy Spirit, by saying on the one hand, that "sanctification of the Spirit" is to be taken in the narrower, and not in the wider sense, which is made necessary already by the order of words; and then, on the other hand, we cannot but say, by dishonestly imputing to the adherents of this view the doctrine "that man is elected for the sake of faith, thus also by implication that he is saved "for the sake of sanctification" and therefore not "by grace alone." Compare with this the author's article on 2 Thess. 2, 13. 14. in Vol. I. of "Theologische Zeitblätter," p. 93-105.

Page 32 etc.: "Even Thomasius identifies election with the universal gracious will of God and calls it 'ordered love'; namely,

that God has instituted the order that they who believe shall be saved, but they who do not believe shall be damned. This, however, is the counsel of redemption, not of election. We Christians know that when we believe we have God's grace and our sins are forgiven us. And this is so certain for true Christians, that they are ready at any instant to give up their lives for it. But now we come to think thus: Yes, I indeed stand in faith, I have forgiveness of sin; but will I also be saved? How many have already had faith, but have allowed themselves to be deceived by their flesh and blood, to be blinded by the world and seduced by the devil, and have fallen away and gone down into hell! Now, God knew beforehand in all eternity that His Christians would be tormented and worried by such thoughts and would be subject to such distress, that they cannot keep themselves in faith. Well then, He thought (to speak humanly) thus: I will remedy this. I will ordain in eternity that this one and that one shall be saved, and all the devils in hell shall not tear them out of my hand; I will not only bring them to faith, but will also keep them therein and save them. Defiance to the creature that would put my counsel to shame! This sweet comfort the modern theologians would take from us. We are indeed to believe that we are in grace, but are to think: Probably I will still be lost; for I know what an evil heart I have, what an impression the world makes upon me, how crafty the devil is; how quickly may I thus fall away and be lost!" —Here the following must be noted especially: 1) How entirely insufficient for the actual attainment of salvation, and therefore how little comfortable, according to this modern Missourian view, is the universal counsel of grace appointed for all poor sinners; 2) How very similar this modern Missourian election is to the unconditional Calvinistic election which operates with an irresistible power—as similar as one egg is to another; 3) How also, if election in this sense is to be consolatory. and is to insure to the Christian the unconditional certainty of salvation, the election itself must be unconditionally certain for man, something that could be the result only of an immediate revelation, as no one is able to obtain this unconditional certainty from the Scriptures; 4) How the opposite doctrine is misrepresented and distorted, so that it may be more easily refuted.—We have the same thing in the following passages: "It is certainly hard to comprehend how a Christian can be altogether quiet who knows nothing about election, especially when he is still in his youth, and when it

does not yet appear that he will soon die. One who is near death may indeed, even if he has not this doctrine, be comfortable; for he tells himself: 'I believe in my dear Savior, and will thereby be saved'; and in such faith he also enters into heaven. But he who is still in his full strength and power must always think: 'What a wicked heart I have; How weak I am over against all temptations. O, will I then be saved?' Just as little, however, can it be understood, how any one can not be altogether content when he believes in election; for such a one can say to his God: 'My God, Thou dost not forsake me; Thou hast not only called me; it is thy grace also that I have been saved out of my destruction. Now I am Thy dear child; it is impossible that Thou shouldst foresake me.' Yes, the fact that God has given us the doctrine of election is an inestimable addition of His love to the gift that He has given us His own Son. It is indeed a still greater love when one does not only give me a gift, but also provides that I may not lose it again. If, for instance, some one should give me a golden staff, and I have yet a thousand miles to travel, the present is indeed a great gift; still if I must travel the long way, perhaps even through a forest infested by robbers, I may in the next hour lose my staff again. If now the giver tells me: 'I will also send you the gift safely through the forest to your home,' it is evidently a greater love, than if he had only given me the gift. Thus also God has not only given us saving faith; He also provides by His election that we may not lose it again; and in case we should lose it for a time, that we may most certainly obtain it again. For an elect person may indeed again lose his faith; but he cannot die without having regained it. This his election will not permit." (P. 35 etc.) "There are very many who admit that there is an election; but they understand thereby nothing save this, that God has foreknown how people would be, and according as He foresaw this in His omniscience, He has said: He who conducts himself thus shall, so I decree, fare thus: He that is godly shall be saved; he that is godless shall be cast into hell. Thereby, however, they reduce the decree of election to a mere foreknowledge of God" (?). "There is a mighty difference between mere foreknowledge and foreordination. For my foreknowing a thing is not the reason for its taking place. On the contrary, I can only foreknow a thing, because it thus takes place. Thus the fact that a thing will occur at a certain time is the reason for God's foreknowing it, and never will a thing occur simply be-

cause God foreknows it; for He also foreknows the evil, and then the evil would be regarded as taking place because God foreknows it. Saturday does not follow Friday because I foreknow it. Just as little will any one reach heaven because God foreknows it. Because it is already certain through election that a person is to reach heaven, therefore God foreknows it; hence election must be something different from mere foreknowledge. It is a decree, an act of God, the reason and cause why this takes place that I am saved. I can, indeed, know that to-morrow some one will be executed. This my knowledge, however, is not the cause that the execution takes place. The judge, on the other hand, who tries the criminal, does not foreknow only, but he determines the execution. His decree, his sentence is the cause that the man must die to-morrow. In the judge, therefore, there are two things, foreordination and foreknowledge, and the latter is conditioned by the former. Likewise there is in God regarding the salvation of the elect not only foreknowledge, but also foreordination; the former is dependent upon the latter. God's decreeing that a number of men shall be saved, is the cause that they are saved. If this were not so, no man would be saved, except at utmost little children. Though God has indeed declared by revelation that he who believes to the end shall be saved, if he does not keep us, all is lost. He who thinks: O, I believe, I have the Word and the Sacraments, now I cannot miss salvation—he knows not himself; for he does not know that in himself there is nothing good, hence no ability to hold fast to the grace of God . . . . Therefore God has decreed: I will cause, will help, and provide that they whom I have foreseen for Myself shall also certainly get to heaven. The result of this is, that whosoever is elected cannot be lost, and if all the gates of hell should conspire against him. God is greater than all. If He has decreed to save me, He will also carry out His decree." (P. 41 sq.) With this mixture of Biblical Lutheran truths and Calvinistic principles compare first of all what has been stated above by Schneckenburger (p. 30 sqq.) and by Fürbringer (p. 54 sqq.), and then note how here also a man of straw is attacked. And moreover, if the argumentation of the last passage be consistently applied, note how God can foreknow only what He Himself has resolved to execute in an irresistible manner; consequently that He either does not at all foreknow evil; or that He foreknows it only because He Himself is its author.

Concerning Matth. 24, 24 we read: "In the last times the

most seductive false prophets shall arise, who shall appear in a manner so as even to deceive, 'if it were possible,' the elect. Note that the Lord does not say,'If they are not on their guard, they shall be seduced,' but 'if it were possible.' He thereby states clearly that it is not possible. There is reason enough for seduction, namely the tempting, the infatuating, the blinding on the part of these people; but election dispels all fear and uneasiness. God Himself provides that the elect are not seduced." (P. 43.) Compare with this Missourian consolation, which consistently and of necessity leads to security, the admonitions of the Holy Scriptures resting on an entirely different basis, 1 Pet. 5, 8: "Be sober, be vigilant" (="be on your guard"); "because your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (something, then, does depend upon our being on our guard); and Phil. 2, 12: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," and the seventh of the well-known eight points of the Formula of Concord, viz: "That the good work which He has begun in them He would strengthen, increase, and support to the end, if they observe God's Word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness, and faithfully use the gifts received."

In Acts 13, 48 the "ordaining to eternal life" is understood in opposition to the common Lutheran, and in harmony with the Calvinistic, view and interpretation, not of election in the sense of the Formula of Concord, whose first constituent part, conditioning everything else, is the universal order of salvation, but of the mysterious election, in the Calvinistic sense, of some particular persons in preference to others, and not based on God's foreknowledge. "They were thus already foreordained persons when they received God's Word in faith, thus evidently ordered from eternity among the number of the elect; and therefore they now attain unto faith." The Lutheran interpretation, viz: "They had entered into the right order," i. e., they belonged to the number of those to whom God according to the universal order of salvation can give faith and salvation and hence also will give and gives both, is thus rejected. (P. 43 sq.)

On Page 52 sq. it is deplored as "lamentable" that Philippi in his "Kirchliche Glaubenslehre" (2d edit., IV., 1, p. 15 sq.) writes as follows: "Looking not so much to the exclusive activity of divine grace in the work of conversion, as rather to the possibility founded in human liberty, that grace, just because it is not compulsory grace, may reach, or may not reach, its goal" ("may

not reach"— these words absolutely necessary for the right understanding of Philippi's meaning are, strange to say, left out by the synodical Report), "we are able to base foreordination unto life as well as unto death on the divine foresight of human conduct" (i. e. toward the unmerited grace which alone works everything, but not irresistibly). In passing, permit the remark that in this passage Philippi, "who otherwise wrote so much that is excellent and was never ashamed of the pure doctrine," just in the very point controverted most violently by modern Missouri, regarding man's "conduct", agrees perfectly with us Ohioans; yet of him it is only said that "in the doctrine of eternal election he was not altogether reliable," while our doctrine is called "heathenish" by Missouri (see "Theologische Zeitblätter", Vol. X., p. 130 sqq., and compare Leyser's and Nicolai's statements above p. 26).

Page 76 sq. reads: "We come now to the fifth thing declared by many to be the cause why a part of mankind is elected unto eternal life, while the other part is rejected. They who would ascribe very little to man say, that the real cause is that there is a number of men who do not cotumaciously resist, and therefore because they do not contumaciously resist, God has elected them. And this does in fact sound like an excellent solution of the problem. Yet unfortunately it is not. In this way the cause of salvation would still be ascribed to man. For if my non-resistance is the basal and real reason, then I would really be my Savior, my Redeemer, and on the last day I could say to those standing on the left hand of the Lord: You too might stand at the right, and might be saved like myself, if you had only done as I did. I have not resisted. But no; it will not be thus. Then we will rather confess, that we were saved only through grace, through God's free mercy." According to this, a person is saved through grace and free mercy only then when God forcibly breaks down resistance, so that he refrains from it only because he cannot do otherwise. For if he could refrain from resistance by the power of grace and would refrain from it, although he could persist in it in spite of grace, this would be merit. And a genuine modern Missourian, like a genuine Calvinist, will say at the judgment day to those standing on the left hand: God unfortunately did not bestow upon you the same grace that He bestowed upon me, since He did not, without permitting Himself to be hindered by the resistance common to us all, bring you to faith and keep you in faith, as He did me. I can only pity you. Had God treated you as He did me,

you would also stand now on the right, as I stand; just as I would stand with you on the left, had He treated me as He did you, had He not given me more grace than He gave you. That ours is thus a lot so different is not due to our different conduct toward grace, but to God who imparts His grace as He wills.

On page 80 sq. the old Lutheran as well as old Missourian doctrine, contradicting the modern Missourian, is thus misrepresented and distorted, so as to make away with it the more easily: "Now we come to the last thing on account of which many say that finally everything really depends on man's decision; namely, that he must believe. Faith, they say, is the reason why a number of men are elected and saved; as unbelief is the reason why others are not saved. For we read in the Scriptures: 'He that believeth shall be saved'; and just as God acts in time, so He has in eternity determined to act. We men indeed often resolve to do a thing, yet often bethink ourselves differently. It is not so with God, He is Omniscience and eternal perfect Wisdom; He knows all things in advance, and is so all-wise that He decrees everything that He actually does in time. 'Here you see', they say, 'since man is saved by faith, God must have decreed in eternity to save man for the sake of faith.' Here then they appear to speak altogether correctly" (?), "and yet it is not spoken correctly. The Scriptures nowhere say that we are saved on account of (wegen) faith, that we are justified and saved because (weil) we believe. Nothing of the kind is found. But this we find, that we are saved through (durch) faith. Here we see that the Scriptures make faith not a cause of justification, but a means thereof. This we admit, that God in eternity decreed to save man also by bringing him to faith and thereby justifying him and permitting him to attain the end of faith, the salvation of the soul." What is here combatted, namely that we are said to be justified and saved for the sake of faith (um des Glaubens willen), as an efficacious or meritorious cause, no Lutheran has ever claimed, neither our old dogmaticians, nor Philippi or Thomasius, nor an Ohioan or Iowaan. It is a man of straw, made to order, which is combatted and overcome with greater courage because there were as yet none daring to combat explicitly and directly the real opponent, and still less hope of conquering him. But what is admitted in the last sentence the most pronounced Calvinist admits; and he who does not admit more in regard to faith and its relation to the choice of the persons who will infallibly be saved, thereby proves

that on this point he is no Lutheran, but a Calvinist (compare above p. 25 sq., 27, and p. 62 sq.; besides this refer to Rev. C. Rohe's excellent article, "Wie die Schrift vom Glauben redet"— How the Scriptures speak of Faith, in Vol. IV. of the "Theol. Zeitblätter," p. 19-28). — This last applies also to the following passage (p. 82), in which the objection: "What then shall we answer him who" (with the old Lutheran dogmaticians) "reasons thus: 'God in election looks to nothing but to the merit of Jesus Christ, yet not in abstracto, but in so far as it is appropriated by any one; so then He has seen that some one accepts the merit of Christ by faith, and therefore this one is elect'?"— is answered precisely as a genuine Calvinist would answer it, viz: "See, my friend, the wedding garment God puts upon us. He foresaw that He would put it upon us; that He would give us faith. How now can this be a cause to be found in man? It is rather a cause to be found in God. If He would not give faith, we would not have it. God has included faith in the decree of election; faith belongs to the golden chain which God, so to say, has forged to draw us out of hell and up from earth into heaven. The first thing is that He has elected me; the second, that He created me; the third, that He redeemed me; the fourth, that He brought me unto faith; the fifth, that He preserves me; the sixth, that He leads me into eternal life." Election in the Missouri-Calvinistic sense, that is, the myterious choice, not in any way conditioned or determined by any regard to man's conduct toward grace, of certain persons in preference to others unto the infallible attainment of salvation, this itself conditions or determines everything else, also the giving of faith; and therefore no determining or decisive regard can be had to faith in this choice.

We now quote the following statements from the Report, which still contain the old Lutheran and the old Missourian doctrine, or at least sound like it.

Page 29 sq.: "No one dare say: 'O, I am elected; though I live now as I please, I will still go to heaven'; for just by living wickedly a man proves that God was necessitated to count him among the reprobate. God indeed would gladly have elected him, for He would save the whole world. But he who is such a wretch that he cares nothing about God, must not be surprised when at last he opens his eyes in hell; for God has elected not only unto salvation, but also unto the entire Christian life. No one will enter heaven except he whom God leads thither on this way;

but our going on this way is not our merit, but God's free grace." The first part of this quotation is genuinely Lutheran. But can he who really assents to this part actually believe that God elected the persons who are to be saved infallibly, without any regard whatever to their foreseen conduct? Whereby then would God be "necessitated to count among the reprobate" a man "living wickedly"? The first half of this passage does not agree with the Calvinistic view of the Report, while the second half with its election "not only unto salvation, but also unto the entire Christian life" agrees well with it. For according to what has been stated above, this can only mean that as he whom God has elected shall and must be saved as surely as God is God, so he shall and must also finally come to true faith and to a Christian life and die therein. The election which works itself out irresistibly provides for this. A man may, indeed he must, reason, according to the Missouri-Calvinistic doctrine, in this way: Whatever may be the manner in which I conduct myself toward the means of grace and otherwise, this has nothing to do with my coming to faith and my being saved. If I am elected, then this election will provide that I finally become a Christian and die as such and thus reach heaven. If, however, I am not elected, it will profit me nothing, though I strive with all power to become a Christian and to live and die as such. "God has elected a number of men already from eternity unto salvation," and this without any decisive regard to their foreseen conduct. "He has decreed these shall and must be saved; and as surely as God is God, so surely also these will be saved, and none but these." No wicked life, not even the worst, can prevent the salvation of him who is elected. Election will certainly provide that he will at least not die in this wicked life. That these are not unwarranted deductions drawn only by ourselves, but rather conclusions following necessarily from the modern Missourian as well as from the Calvinistic doctrine, is demonstrated by the quotations given above.

On page 33 we read: "An excellent definition of predestination is given by the Lutheran theologian Wandalinus, Professor in Copenhagen, in the following words: 'Predestination or election is the eternal act of God by which He has chosen, according to the pleasure of His will, and only for the sake of the merit of Christ, from the whole mass of the fallen human race, all those unto eternal life of whom He has foreseen that, through the means of salvation to be offered in time to all without distinction,

they would truly and to the end believe in Christ, the Redeemer of all men, so that by virtue of this infallible and immutable decree and act they might attain salvation to the praise of His glorious grace.'" This "excellent definition", however, is that of all our old Lutheran dogmaticians, and briefly and tersely summarizes that doctrine which is in direct opposition to the Calvinistic view of the Report here under consideration!—On the same page the explanation of Dieterich's Catechism cited above (p. 64) is termed "good", although the same thing is true of it as of Wandalinus' definition.

Page 68 reads: "Also Joh. Gerhard writes: 'Although God in the ordered mode of His operation does not convert those who despise and persecute the preachers of the Word, and who blaspheme the Word and resist the Holy Spirit; yet this does not prove that it depends upon man that he be converted, as it is the work of the Holy Spirit, and not of human powers, that man is converted by the hearing of the Word. That which removes a hindrance is not the same as an efficacious cause.'" If the modern Missourians would heed the distinction here made by Gerhard they could never assert that it is synergism to teach, as we do, that conversion and salvation depends on man's conduct in so far, but only in so far, as "God in the ordered plan of His operation does not convert those who do not hear the Word, etc." Gerhard indeed rejects the term we use, but only in so far as it is understood in a manner entirely different from that in which we understand it, namely, in so far as it is made to say that it is "the work of human powers", and not exclusively the work of the Holy Spirit, "that man is converted by the hearing of the Word." That man can and must "remove a hindrance", if he would be converted and saved, namely his wilful contempt for and neglect of the means of grace, Gerhard asserts as distinctly as we do; and he denies, just as we do, that this can be called an "efficacious cause" of conversion and salvation, in other words, that there is any synergism whatever in that assertion.

On page 70 Dannhauer's words are approvingly quoted: "Also the decision of our will in the first act of conversion has always been ascribed by the orthodox not to the power and cooperation of man, but to the Holy Spirit working through the Word upon the will, which remains passive therein. And yet this decision is not a thing of necessity or of irresistible compulsion, although, presupposing the divine order, it is infallible. For God

has bound Himself by the surest and holiest promises to decide man himself for conversion, when he is in the workshop of the Holy Spirit, and does not oppose a wicked resistance to the means of salvation." This is exactly what we mean, when we say that conversion and salvation depend in a certain sense upon man's conduct toward the means of grace; and it is exactly what modern Missouri denies and reviles as "heathenish."

It is the same with the passage quoted approvingly from Joh. Olearius: "The doctrine of the Lutherans . . . ascribes everything to God and nothing to man. This is not contradicted . . . by 4) non-resistance; because even this is a gift of the Holy Spirit, who removes and prevents this resistance, which is our own entirely, through the ordinary means of salvation. For non-resistance is by no means a causative exertion of influence, but only a non-hindering of the activity of one acting; just as the leper, Matth. 8, and Lazarus, John 11, by not resisting Christ, were by no means the cause of the miraculous cleansing or the awakening." (P. 79.) A man then may put an end to his resistance by virtue of the operation of "the ordinary means of salvation," without an especial, mysterious grace of election. And when he thus puts an end to it, he is by no means thereby a "cause" of his own conversion and salvation. Accordingly our doctrine in teaching this is not in the least synergistic.

Likewise the quotation p. 85 from Calov agrees completely with our doctrine, but not with the doctrine of modern Missouri. Calov says: "Not on account of faith are we called the elect, but through faith in Christ, of which the former is the designation of the moving cause, the latter of the instrumental cause. Meissner reminds us that: 'When faith is called the cause of election, not the moving or impelling cause dare be understood thereby'. 'For', says Hutter, 'election does not depend on faith as its moving or meritorious cause.' . . . And Gerhard says, that it is absurd to say, that faith is the impelling cause of election." According to modern Misouri, faith is not even the instrumental cause of election, something Calov, Meissner, Hutter, Gerhard, and all our dogmaticians most firmly assert over against the Calvinists (compare above p. 25 sqq.). — On the same page the following words of Dannhauer are quoted: "Predestination does not depend upon any work, any merit, any motive emanating from us, or through us, or inhering in us, for the sake of which election took place; not upon faith inasmuch as it is a work

or the fruit of faith. For thus we also say that the decree is purely a merciful one. The fact that it is merciful excludes merits, but not the order; faith is here not a work or merit, but the foreseen beggar's hand. Hence not even the smallest measure of glory is left to man, for he receives and does not give or earn. Hence God saw nothing of active worthiness in man, nothing good that was not from God Himself. God remains the cause and never becomes that which is caused. In reality there is in Him nothing of the nature of a priority of time; yet His will does not depend upon His foresight, although this, in our conception of it, is prior." It seems as if this passage is cited especially for the sake of the last sentence, as it otherwise teaches decidedly our doctrine and not the modern Missourian; at least the words: "God remains the cause and never becomes that which is caused," are printed in italics. But here it can be seen distinctly how deceptively, because torn out of their connection or mutilated, the utterances of our old dogmaticians are quoted in this Report, as if somehow they favored the modern Missourian doctrine. Nearly the entire page preceding this last sentence in Dannhauer's Hodosophia pp. 289 sq. is left out, and this without even indicating it by marks of elision, a page which most decisively opposes the modern Missourian position, and puts the italicized sentence into its true, thoroughly anti-Calvinistic light. The words omitted before this sentence, although absolutely necessary for its right understanding, read as follows, omitting a difficult quotation from Aristotle: "Hence the certainty of election is not unconditional (to assume which is neither safe nor certain), but on the condition of persevering faith it is safe and certain. And hence this is certain that faith is of God; but of man is the repulsing (repulsa) or non-repulsing of the object of faith. Nor is this the case that, because God regarded foreseeen faith in man's election, therefore man has chosen God; just as if you would say: Nerva has adopted Trajan as his successor on account of his ability, consequently Trajan has adopted Nerva. Hence we conclude that faith belongs to the divine order, this order, however, God has instituted as well as foreseen, and has also made it the norm of His election (juxta illum elegerit). Hence nothing hinders (us from concluding) that something may be the effect of one acting and at the same time a reason or a cause foreseen by the one acting (et simul rationem seu causam ab agente prævisam); for a house

is both the work of the builder and the final cause (causa finalis) moving the builder to erect the house . . . Although the Apostle says that we are elected that we may be holy, Eph. 1, 14, that we may manifest our gratitude by holiness of life; as when a servant would say to the physician to whom his master had given a gift: Thou hast received a glorious gift (tibi sors lautæ eleemosynæ contigit), because thou hast grasped it with the hand and not maliciously rejected it, so that thou mayest be faithful to thy benefactor in the future. So man is elected through justifying faith, that he may do the works of justifying faith. Although faith is not the cause of the decree (of election), it is nevertheless the means for attaining salvation foreseen in the decree. We assert that the foreseeing of faith is (according to our human conception) the first thing, not actual faith." And now comes the sentence spoken of above: "God remains the cause etc." After this sentence we read: "This testamentary condition" (faith) "is the reason of the decree of election: not because God has decreed that Paul should believe, has he believed, but because Paul has constantly believed and not resisted the means of salvation, has he been elected (Haec conditio testamentaria est ratio decreti prædestinatorii, non quia Deus decrevit Paulum credere, ideo credidit, sed quia Paulus constanter credidit ac mediis salutis non resistit, electus est). Reason (ratio), I say, not cause properly so-called (non causa proprie dicta), to say nothing of a meritorious cause, but a part of the order of predestination (pars ordinis prædestinatorii)."

The above sentence from Dannhauer, torn from its connection and mutilated, is thus cited in the Report to prove that God has not elected in view of faith, while in its connection and when given completely it proves this very thing and defends it over against the Calvinistic objections which now also Missouri has appropriated! This sentence, as also the other utterances of our old dogmaticians quoted in a similar dishonest manner by the Report, can be cited only in favor of what the opponents of modern Missouri have never denied, but always maintained, namely, that faith is no efficacious or meritorious reason of election. Yet how dishonest to say in immediate connection with the above sentence from Dannhauer: "Spener speaks altogether differently. He writes: 'It is impossible that the elect should be seduced to the end, Matth. 24, 24. Yet election is not the cause that such people remain faithful, but because they will remain faithful, (this) has in-

duced the Lord to elect them.'" Dannhauer, in the words quoted above and omitted by the Report, has said the very same thing (compare also Rev. Fürbringer's statement, p. 55 sqq., especially p. 57 sq.)! Thus the attempt is made to create the impression as if at least the old dogmaticians, with whom Missouri had hitherto been constantly fighting her battles, were in reality on the side of modern Missouri, whereas, unless Dr. Walther was suffering from the weaknesses of old age and was therefore thoroughly unfit for the presumed genuinely Lutheran reconstruction of a doctrine so difficult and important as that of predestination, he must certainly have known that these dogmaticians taught the very thing he rejected, and rejected the very thing he taught, and that it was a dishonest procedure to cite them against a Spener, Philippi, etc., since they thoroughly and completely agree with them; although perhaps not in every expression, yet in what constitutes the real difference between Calvinism and Lutheranism.

III.

THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

C. THE SYNODICAL REPORT OF THE WESTERN DISTRICT FOR THE YEAR 1879.

The Calvinistic views of the synodical Report of the Western District for the year 1877 were recognized at least by several members of the Missouri Synod, and this with astonishment and sorrow. The beginnings of these views, which had indeed appeared already before this on several occasions, although only in a rudimentary and cautious form (compare above p. 65 sqq.), had been charitably interpreted, especially on account of the preceding, accompanying, and following genuinely Lutheran statements, as not being meant so badly. This was the case, for instance, with the present writer. After Dr. Walther's articles against Dr. Fritschel (compare above p. 67) had made him uneasy, and he had expressed his doubts concerning them in private and in public, not a little to the vexation of Dr. Walther and those of his adherents who followed him through thick and thin, he unfortunately permitted himself to be quieted and confused, and, in the opinion that Dr. Walther was nevertheless right, even wrote an article in reply to Dr. Fritschel in Brobst's "Monatshefte," attempting to demonstrate that the latter's position was not correct. But he at once saw from Dr. Fritschel's reply that, although his form of expression, unless fully explained, might be misunderstood, the doctrine taught therein was not contrary to the Bible and the Confession, but in fullest harmony with both. The author, therefore, did not pursue the matter further, thinking that the whole controversy was due rather to Dr. Walther's emphasizing the one side sharply and in a manner somewhat onesided, and Dr. Fritschel's emphasizing the other. Something of the same kind occured in the case also of Dr. F. A. Schmidt, at this time theological professor in the Norwegian Theological Seminary at Madison, Wis., who already at the meeting of the Northern District

in 1868 had expressed his doubts, although only very cautiously, in the form of a question, concerning the Calvinizing utterances made there (compare above p. 65). The first man who, as far as we know, bestirred himself against the Report of '77 was Rev. H. A. Allwardt, at this time, and still, pastor in Lebanon, Wis., a man who was as loyal a Missourian as any ever was, yet not in slavish dependence. In the excellent "Zeugnis wider die neue, falsche Gnadenwahlslehre der Missouri Synode, etc." (A Testimony Against the New False Doctrine of the Missouri Synod on Predestination), written by him, he reports as follows, p. 226 sqq. (compare later on in the present volume):*

"A little after New Year in 1878 I read the Report of '77, and found to my great dismay that the doctrine it contained was not the Lutheran doctrine of predestination. To be sure, Dr. Walther did not say openly and honestly even here that the old teachers of our Church had erred. On the contrary, he quotes them in great number, as if he fully agreed with them; but his own remarks, especially his interpretation of the Scripture passages concerned, show a decided Calvinistic coloring, so that this Report alone already reveals all the ambiguity of Dr. Walther's doctrine on predestination. After attempting for months to find a Biblical Lutheran meaning in the erroneous propositions of Dr. Walther, I finally laid the matter before the President of my District, Rev. Strasen, about in the end of March, and in this connection I learned that Prof. Schmidt, too, did not agree with the Report and had declared this to several leading men in his Synod (Norwegian). (The meeting of the Missouri Synod and its dealing with predestination, which is said to have afforded the motive for Prof. Schmidt's opposition, did not take place till the end of May!) I did not press President Strasen to give me an immediate expression of his opinion. I had only explained my doubts to him and given my reasons, and had requested him to investigate the matter. When I again spoke to him about it some time later, I found that he had reached the same conclusion to which I had come. Nothing further occured in the matter during the rest of the year, except that I tested Dr. Walther's propositions again and again by the Scriptures and by the Confessions, and that I studied our

*As a correction of the Missourian vilifications, directed especially against Dr. Schmidt regarding the outbreak of the predestination controversy, this report coming from a man as trustworthy and well-informed as any in the Missouri Synod, will be welcome to our readers.

old dogmaticians diligently, as far as I could secure their writings, and that I spoke with President Strasen on the subject almost every week. At Easter (still prior to the meeting of Synod) I spoke also with Prof. Schmidt. And from this time on until October, 1879, we three, President Strasen, Prof. Schmidt, and I, very frequently discussed the whole matter, and we were agreed in our judgment concerning the Report. At Christmas Prof. Schmidt again visited us, and expressed his determination to discuss the doctrine of predestination in the Lutheran Standard, for which paper he had already written frequently; but his intention was to do this without in the least attacking the Missouri Synod. He desired simply to set forth the doctrine, as he could not satisfy his conscience by remaining altogether silent in the face of error. We two, President Strasen and I, dissuaded him from this course and urged him to confer privately with the men at St. Louis; and this, at the further advice of men in his own Synod, he did. As a result, a colloquium was arranged between Dr. Walther and Prof. Schmidt, which was held in July, 1879, in Columbus, Ohio. Dr. Walther, however, after conferring a day and a half, broke off the colloquium, saying that he had no more time. Yet a renewal of the discussion was arranged for the following year, in which several others were also to take part representing both sides. Dr. Walther also asked Prof. Schmidt whether he would refrain from writing meanwhile, and received the answer that this would depend on the position the Missouri Synod would take in the matter in autumn. The Western District had yet one thesis left over for consideration from the year '77, and Prof. Schmidt repeatedly expressed the hope to me that perhaps Dr. Walther would yield so far at this meeting in the autumn of '79, as to satisfy us and to make even the colloquium in the summer of 1880 superfluous. So far removed from his mind, even at this time, was any thought of making a public and direct attack upon Dr. Walther. And this was more than a year after the meeting which is said to have given him the pretext for beginning a public controversy. . . . I for my part had sent a paper to the general president of the Missouri Synod, Rev. Schwan, in May 1879, in which I set forth at length my doubts in regard to the Report of '77, and said openly that I found 'the beginnings of Calvinism' in it. I requested him to advise me how to act in the matter." President Schwan thought it best to send Rev. Allwardt's paper to Dr. Walther so that he could "express himself more fully on the

subject." Rev. Allwardt gave his consent to this, and stated publicly at a Pastoral Conference that he was opposed to the Calvinizing doctrine of predestination contained already in the synodical Report of the Northern District of '71; where the attempt was made to refute him, for instance, by quoting from John Gerhard Calvinistic sentences which he quotes and refutes, as though they were the doctrine of Gerhard and of the Lutheran Church! "During the same week, however, during which this Conference took place in Oshkosh, Wis., the Western District Synod met in St. Louis, near the end of September, 1879. While Prof. Schmidt and myself, as also others who knew of the matter, had some hope that Dr. Walther would here explain himself sufficiently, and had no expectation in any case that he would touch upon our objections while we were absent, he, as the Report shows, did this very thing, in a way I would have considered absolutely impossible. While he had broken off the colloquium in Columbus and arranged another for the following year with his opponent, and had asked of him to refrain from public attack till that time, and while he had not answered a syllable as yet to my writing sent him by the President, he abused our arguments thoroughly before this Synod, caricatured them most shamefully, ridiculed them, and designated us by the most vicious heretical names. We are described as rationalists, synergists, Pelagians, followers not only of the papists in general, but especially also of that 'cunning and treacherous Bellarmin' (a Jesuit)."

Having mentioned by way of introduction these facts, which throw light upon several points, particularly upon Dr. Walther's customary and favorite way of treating his "opponents," we now turn our attention to the Report of '77. Side by side we find Calvinistic views, old Lutheran and old Missourian reminiscences, and the distorted doctrine not only of the "opponents," but also of the old Lutheran dogmaticians, who were still called upon for assistance in the old favorite way. In the following we furnish a number of proofs for this.

The basis for the doctrinal discussion consisted of five theses into which Dr. Walther had divided the last one of the theses of '77, which for lack of time had not been discussed. These five theses are to set forth the right use of the doctrine of predestination, and they are wholly composed of sentences and passages from Art. XI. of the Formula of Concord. The first contains the main part of §. 12, on p. 652 of Jacobs' Transla-

tion of the Book of Concord; the second, § 25 and the beginning of § 26 on p. 653; the third, the middle of § 26; the fourth, § 70-72 on p. 661, etc.; the fifth, § 73 on p. 662. All these theses or utterances of the Formula of Concord rightly understood, i. e. according to the sense and connection of the Confession, as also according to the universal interpretation of the Lutheran Church, completely overthrow the modern Missouri doctrine. They are intelligible only when election in the narrow sense, the choice of persons who will infallibly and alone be saved, is taken as a self-evident and necessary result of the universal counsel of salvation, and not made to stand by the side of this depending merely upon the secret pleasure of God. Everything said in the elaboration of thesis 1 against the Calvinists applies just as well to the modern Missourians, as their doctrine also, if consistently carried out, like that of the Calvinists, leads either to security or to despair. That modern Missouri denies this does not alter the fact; the Calvinists also deny the correctness of the charges brought against them as necessary conclusions from their doctrine. In spite of this the Report in question repeats these charges as well founded. But what is right in the case of Calvinists must be fair for modern Missourians. If logical conclusions are valid when made against the former, they are no less valid when made against the latter. "God has foreordained or chosen the saints whom he wishes to save in Christ, from all eternity, freely and of pure grace, without any regard to man. . . . We disapprove of the godless expression of some who say: Few are chosen, and since I am not certain whether I am one of them, I will thoroughly enjoy myself here. Others say: If I am predestinated or chosen of God, nothing that I do will prevent my salvation, which is already immovably fixed. But if I belong to the reprobate class, no faith, no repentance will help me, since God's decree cannot be altered. Therefore, all instruction and admonition is useless. Against such reasoning the Apostle's word is directed: 'The servant of the Lord must be apt to teach, instructing those that oppose themselves, if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth, and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil who are taken captive by him at his will' (2 Tim. 2). . . . We therefore censure those who without taking into consideration Christ raise the question whether they are chosen, and what God in all eternity determined concerning them. For we must listen

to the preaching of the Gospel and believe it and hold fast without doubting, that if we believe in Christ and abide in Him we are chosen, etc." Who says this? It reads precisely like a passage from the Report of the Western District of the Missouri Synod for '77, or for '79. Yet it is a passage from the genuinely Reformed second Helvetian Confession prepared by the Calvinist Bullinger (compare Bachman, "Die wichtigsten Symbole," etc.— The Most Important Symbols, etc.— p. 50 sq.). In fact the entire 10th article of this Calvinistic Confession with its heading: "Concerning the Divine Predestination and Election of Saints," might have a place without any essential change in one of these Missouri Reports as "pure doctrine." In precisely the same way as the modern Missourians the Calvinists defend themselves against the accusations brought against them as logical conclusions from their position, by talking about conclusions that cannot be allowed here, about taking captive our reason under the obedience of faith, about mysteries to be most humbly adored. This method, too, is a proof of the kinship of the two. At any rate modern Missourians have no right to complain when we use against them the same weapons they employ against the Calvinists, i. e. when we appeal to logical conclusions.

But we turn now to some of the characteristic utterances of the Report of '79.

On page 39 sq., is found the famous passage: "The troubled conscience thinks: If God knows that I will go to hell, I will certainly go there, do what I will. The number of the elect cannot be increased or diminished. What God foreknows must take place. If I belong not to the elect, I may hear God's Word ever so diligently, have myself absolved, go to the Lord's Supper, this is all useless. What does Luther answer? 'This indeed is true and must be admitted.' He here invents no other gospel for him, but holds him fast by this truth." But Luther does not say what this Report makes him say. He only declares "that God Almighty knows from eternity" how every man will fare and how (according to the subsequent will of God which has regard to man's conduct) every man indeed shall fare. The Report, however, here reveals its own genuinely Calvinistic trend, according to which everything depends on the choice of persons, and yet this choice itself is said to have been made without any regard to man's foreseen conduct. And what the Report then adds in the line of "universal medicine," "consolation of the Gospel," is altogether similar to

the close of the above quotation from the Reformed Confession. Note also how the Report even goes beyond this. What is there said to be contrary to the word of the Apostle is here called by the Report "gospel" and "truth."

On page 37 sq., a passage from Seb. Schmidt is quoted and misinterpreted, which, in spite of some peculiarity in its wording, agrees perfectly with the doctrine of our old dogmaticians, as it derives the choice of person and what most naturally, according to the appendix to the well-known eight points (Jacobs' Transl. p. 653, § 23), pertains thereto, from the subsequent will of God (voluntas consequens), i. e. from that will which on the basis of God's foreknowledge has regard to the different conduct of men toward the means of grace. In connection with this we read: "When God gives the elect His grace for their perseverance, the non-elect have no right to accuse God that He did not give to them also this same rich measure of grace; for God does not owe us an especial, greater measure of grace. God would point him who would do this to the Scripture passage: 'Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil because I am good?' A clear example of this rich measure of grace we find in Paul. He had fought against the Christians in the most wicked way. He tried to make them blaspheme by threatening them with death; and behold, he is converted, and that, too, in the most wonderful way. Christ Himself appears to him, speaks with him, and tells him where to go to learn the way unto salvation. This is evidently a 'gratia amplior,' a greater grace than God vouchsafes to others, whereby He would especially glorify His goodness. Fathers often act similarly. Many a father is more gracious to one child than to another, because it obeys him better and gives him more joy than the other. He gives food and drink also to the latter and seeks its happiness also; yet upon the former he bestows a greater abundance of love's gifts. Thus also God deals with us; only He does not even ask whether we have obeyed or not, but does as He wills."—In this confused passage note especially the following: (1) Contrary to Seb. Schmidt the richer grace, which for instance a Lutheran possesses as compared with a Romanist or Calvinist, the child of a living Christian as compared with that of a hypocrite, which, however, can also be wilfully resisted (Acts 26, 19; Matth. 11, 20 sqq.), is here identified with the "grace for perseverance," which in distinction from the former is offered to all without exception, and according to Seb.

Schmidt "is promised and offered earnestly according to the antecedent will even to the reprobate," and is not imparted only to those who by wilful and persistent resistance, which they might refrain from by virtue of the grace working in them, reject it. 2) According to the statements of the Report God does not deal like a father, but altogether differently, that is, arbitrarily, bestowing or withholding the grace of perseverance in faith, and therewith salvation, without any regard to the use man has made of grace previously received. Thus we have here also the "shall-and-must" grace of the Report of '77. And when the Report seeks to utilize what Seb. Schmidt says: "And thus we can say with Luther that man is predestinated to faith itself," it gains nothing at all, for Seb. Schmidt derives this very predestination from the subsequent will briefly characterized above, and not, as do the modern Missourians, from the antecedent will. In other words, Seb. Schmidt regards that man as predestinated unto faith of whom God has foreseen that he would permit himself to be led upon the universal way of salvation as this is set forth in the eight points mentioned. In spite of the unusual form of his expressions Seb. Schmidt agrees throughout with our other dogmaticians, and not with the Calvinists and Missourians, who have no place in their doctrine of predestination for the subsequent will of God and its regard to man's conduct. This appeal of modern Missouri to Seb. Schmidt is, therefore, nothing but empty show and deception, at least self-deception.

In the elaboration of thesis 3, p. 50 sqq., we for the first time meet that perversion of the Formula of Concord which recurs so frequently and in such manifold variations afterwards, according to which the eight points referred to do not aim to state what the Confession means by election, and what it considers to be contained therein. "When we speak of election we must include all those stages by which God would carry out in man the decree of election" (i. e. save all those chosen without regard to their conduct). "For God has not said: I have chosen a number and they shall reach heaven, and that settles it. On the contrary, He has said what He would do now regarding those whom He has elected. He has loved them all from eternity, sent His Son for the whole world, sends His Word and bestows the Holy Spirit, gives them faith, justifies them, keeps them that they may remain in faith, seeks them again when they stumble and fall away, and helps them on into everlasting salvation. All this we must add. But when

it is added, we must not say: This is the thing itself of which we are treating" (i. e. election). "It would be false, for instance, to preach about repentance only in so far as it consists of contrition. Faith must also be preached. For repentance, even when wrought by the law, is worthless, unless the Gospel follow and work faith. And as it would be a godless way of proceeding to preach concerning predestination merely this: There is a mysterious decree of God, made by God in eternity, that He would save a certain number of men; these will surely be saved. And there is another number of men who according to God's decree, although not by his decree, are damned. The number of both is fixed, and there will never be less of either. All this is true. And still it would be a shameful way of preaching, to say merely this and nothing more. The hearers would then draw all sorts of dangerous conclusions. No; the whole counsel must be proclaimed; then the doctrine of election will become clear. This very thing is what makes the teaching of the Calvinists so horrible. They speak only of a mystery; and instead of directing the hearer to the Scriptures they direct him to his reason, and then the outcome is a Calvinistic predestination. But let it not be misunderstood. This all is to be added according to the Confessions of our Church, and therefore is not the same as though the Church had said: There is no predestination" (most assuredly none of the "opponents" had ever said or thought this). "What a sin! God has revealed a religion to us showing us how to reach heaven, and here certain people come" (who? the "opponents"?) "and remove one of the most important, one of the most consolatory doctrines" (the modern Missourian, Calvinistic absolute predestination?) "from the Scriptures. Wo to him that does this! What those doctrines are that must be taught in addition the Formula of Concord tells us. It names the following eight points" (here these points are quoted, found in Jacobs' Transl. p. 652 sq., §§ 15-22). "This all must be presented; but it is not predestination. Now comes a sentence" (i. e. the appendix to the eight points § 23), "which as the last part of this doctrine is purposely not numbered. This sentence declares what election is. . . . Just because God according to election (!) leads us to heaven in this way alone, the way must be described, so that people may not think thus: It all depends on my election. God has decided this once for all, and it can never be changed. For the result of this would be that nothing further would be preached. But it is a different thing to

say: God has chosen a small number, and has not chosen a large number, and these will be lost; and then to add: He whom God has chosen will come to faith, will be justified, regenerated, preserved till death. This God has revealed. Here no man dare think that this dark counsel no one can know. No; this the whole world may know; in all these works is revealed what God thought in eternity. Thus God would lead men to salvation. If you will not permit yourself to be led thus, then you may indeed feel assured that you are cast away. God would not have cast you away, if you had not wilfully and contumaciously resisted. God has sought also you, but you did not permit Him to find you. He has knocked at your door, but you have not opened unto Him, in spite of the fact that God gave you grace thereto."

Note in this connection the following: (1) This Report, like that of '77, mutilates and falsifies the doctrine of our old dogmaticians, so as to create the impression as though they are, at least in the main thing, on the side of modern Missouri; and then it falsifies and exaggerates the doctrine of the Calvinists so as to make it appear as though there were really an essential difference between them and the modern Missourians. But in both respects the very opposite is the case. In its real principles modern Missouri is irreconcilably in opposition to the old Lutheran dogmaticians, and in full accord with the Calvinists. It is simply not true to say that the Calvinists teach nothing at all of the contents of these eight points, and that they speak "only about the mystery." They speak of these eight points precisely as does modern Missouri, namely as the way in which God brings to faith and saves the elect whom He has chosen absolutely, without any condition, and without any regard to their conduct; and they deny just as well as modern Missouri does, that these eight points are the universal way of salvation from the institution of which the choice of persons must logically follow. Every attack thus made against the Calvinists is doing gross injustice to them, and is apt only to throw dust into people's eyes and to deceive them as to the close relationship which exists between the Calvinists and modern Missouri, and which the latter would not like to have generally known. — (2) With the above modern Missourian view of the eight points, as containing something that must be "taught in addition," something that does not belong as an essential part to election, compare what precedes the eight points in the Confession itself as a preface

(Jacobs' Transl., p. 652, §§ 13, 14), and what is added as a conclusion (p. 653, § 24: "All this," i. e. the eight points together with the appendix, "according to the Scriptures, is comprised in the doctrine concerning the eternal election of God to adoption and eternal salvation, and should be comprised with it, and not omitted, etc."); and compare also our remarks on the line of thought in the Formula of Concord as set forth above, p. 39 sqq., especially p. 42 and p. 45. In these remarks also Chemnitz is quoted as a witness fully competent to vouch for the correctness of our view, which is in direct opposition to that of modern Missouri and in fullest harmony with that of our old Lutheran dogmaticians. Naturally the chief author of the Report under consideration, Dr. Walther, knew also these utterances of Chemnitz quoted by us. And just as naturally he found it necessary to face these utterances, and therefore he quoted the passages cited by us above, p. 45 sq. And now how does he treat it? Hear and be astounded! He seizes upon the closing words of the quotation: "This is the sum and the analysis" (the unfolding, the setting forth of the chief constituent parts by name) "of the doctrine of predestination, as it is revealed in the Word"; and then he adds: "It must be remembered, that this is not the decree itself, but this is the manner in which it is revealed to us in the Bible. . . . Chemnitz does not say: This is the predestination upon which God has determined in eternity; but he says: Inasmuch and in so far as it is revealed to us" (p. 55)! What does any man know concerning predestination "inasmuch and in so far as it is" not "revealed to us" in the Word? Has modern Missouri perhaps special revelations in this regard? Chemnitz, and we, certainly care to know nothing of this, but are satisfied to know only the sum and chief parts of what God has revealed in His Word concerning predestination, and are sure that this revelation agrees perfectly with the actual facts and teaches us indeed what "the predestination upon which God has determined in eternity" is. Yet here we see how the attempt to smuggle false doctrine under a false name into the Church leads from one folly and deception to another—a truth which modern Missouri has confirmed, and not here alone, by its procedure in the predestination controversy.—(3) The last series of sentences quoted above from the Report sounds like old Lutheran and old Missourian doctrine, but does not at all agree with the real idea of the whole passage quoted, nor with the position of the whole Report as such, namely, that God has chosen those who

alone are to be infallibly saved, without inquiring how men would conduct themselves toward His saving grace.

On page 64 sq. are found the following confused utterances regarding the certainty of election: "We by no means teach that a man may be absolutely certain that he will be saved. Yet this must be rightly understood. What does it mean when we say: I am absolutely certain that I will be saved? It means this: I know with complete certainty that I will be saved, even though I steal and commit adultery, murder and cease reading the Bible and praying" (yet it may also mean, and does actually mean among modern Missourians this: I am altogether certain that, though I fall into such sins and live in them for years, yet God will finally bring me to repentance and let me die in faith. See above p. 75 sqq.) "This would be an accursed certainty; it would be nothing but the most shameful carnal security. No; if I am certain of my salvation in faith, I am certain of it with fear and trembling, as we will see more distinctly later on. If there is a chair in a room and I see it, I am absolutely certain it is there; for God has given me eyes, not to deceive me, but that I may see things as they are. But it is not so with salvation; for I have no eye with which to look into the Book of Life. On the contrary, I am certain of my salvation a posteriori, namely, for the reason that I believe. Just as Moses could not behold God's countenance, but could only look behind Him, so we also cannot look upon God's face,but only from behind" (yet can it be aught but a seeing of God's "face," a wanting to be certain, a priori, and not a posteriori, when with modern Missouri the "infallible" certainty of perseverance in faith is deduced from the present existence of faith?). "When I say: I believe with certainty that I will be saved, I must also at once add: But, of course, when I am no more a Christian, all is over" (why then is modern Missouri not satisfied with a conditional certainty of election, a certainty infallible on a condition which every man may fulfill by the power of God's grace?) "But this is not to say that I may not be truly certain of my salvation; for to be absolutely certain and to be uncertain are not at all opposites. I can be fully certain" (to be sure, yet not in the sense of the utterances of modern Missouri as quoted in the preceding part of this work). "For I must always think thus: Of course, if I would become an impious wicked rascal and would reject the Lord Jesus and would wallow again in the mire of the world like a swine, then God has given me

no security. Then He declares: Let him go his way. Yes, then I would be worse than before. But while I know and continually consider this, I still believe quite firmly that my dear Lord Jesus Christ will not forsake me. For my comfort is not that I have embraced Christ, but that He has embraced me; not that I am faithful, but that He is faithful; not that I remain in Christ, but that He remains in me; and therefore I am of the fixed conviction, that I shall be saved, and that the Lord will aid me to the end. Now we hear it said: "Against this" (?) "doctrine of the certainty of election the one fact that there are temporary believers stands like a very wall of iron. It is said: The Scriptures teach unmistakably that there are true believers who believe only for a time; and this is directly opposed to the doctrine of the certainty of election; just as the doctrine of the Lutherans that even the wicked receive Christ's true body and blood in the Holy Supper contradicts the doctrine of the Zwinglians that Christ's body and blood is not present in the Supper. If all believers are to be certain of their election, it is said, then temporary believers are likewise to be certain. Yet these evidently are not elected, for they will not be saved; so then they are to believe a lie. Nor can you escape this conclusion. We answer: . . . This objection is only a conclusion of reason, and most certainly cannot overthrow the precious promise given to us. We indeed cannot solve the apparent contradiction in regard to temporary believers, for we are poor creatures. But this shall not make us to go counter to God's clear Word and to rob ourselves and Christendom of such an exceedingly consolatory doctrine."

In this connection note the following: (1) No "opponent" has ever had anything to object to the doctrine of the certainty of election as presented in the first half of this quotation; but every "opponent" has indeed had serious objections to the passages quoted in the preceding part of this work from the Report of '77, which either declare directly or necessarily presume an unconditional certainty, and which have nowhere been retracted in this Report of '79, the contents of which must of necessity follow from a doctrine not proceeding logically from the universal order of salvation and still said to be full of consolation. (2) Then too the contradiction here claimed to exist between the Scriptural doctrine that there are temporary believers and the modern Missouri doctrine of the certainty of election shows that this latter doctrine goes beyond what is stated in the first half of the quota-

tion, i. e. that it maintains, contrary to the Scriptures, the Confession, and the dogmaticians, an unconditional certainty. (3) Here we find an application of that universal remedy of modern Missouri, afterwards used so liberally, whereby every difficulty and embarrassment produced by the irrefutable arguments of the wicked "opponents" is removed, viz: the "mystery." When, after the manner of Christ and the Apostles and the fathers and the Reformers, the attempt is made to interpret Scripture by Scripture and to show thus that the apparently altogether general statement of one Scripture passage as taken by itself must be restricted and limited by another passage (compare, for instance, John 14, 28 with 10, 30; Mark 10, 11 with Matth. 5, 32 and 1 Cor. 7, 15), and when this is to be applied also to the Missourian innovations with their alleged Scripture proofs, as in the case under consideration, then Missouri objects and seeks refuge in its "mystery," according to which one Scripture passage is no longer to be explained by another, but both are to be left standing unreconciled side by side, without concern as to the resultant contradiction. In this way every heretic might shield his pet doctrine, as every heresy has originated from the onesided emphasis placed on certain Scripture passages, without paying sufficient regard to the parallel passages on the opposite side. Thus, for instance, popery might undertake to found its hierarchial claims on Matth. 16, 18, its doctrine of works on the Epistle of James, etc.; the champions of the absolute necessity of baptism might quote John 3, 5 for their position. The clear doctrine of the Scriptures concerning the existence of temporary believers compels us to understand those Scripture passages which seem to teach an unconditional certainty of election and seem to say that this certainty is furnished by faith, in such a manner that this is not the case; as also the common experience of sober Christians speaks against such an unconditional certainty.

It is one of the tricks of this Report, that while it softens the expressions for its own position as much as possible, it perverts the position of the "opponents" so as to make them teach that a Christian must "doubt" his election and salvation; and then against this man of straw our old teachers are quoted, for instance P. Leyser (p. 79) and Lassenius (p. 80 sq.), who of course in every particular oppose this figment, as we do ourselves and have always done! For we most heartily say with the latter: "Because you have hitherto had and still have faith in Christ in child-

like trust upon His sufferings and merits, and by the assistance of the Holy Spirit desire to remain constant therein to your end, and likewise use most diligently all means for strengthening your faith, and call upon the Holy Spirit for His assistance therein, therefore, you dare not at all doubt your election. God indeed knows His elect, and you among them, He is your Shepherd, and you are His sheep; abide as such in due obedience and love to Him, and you will receive infallibly by His grace the end of your faith, namely, everlasting salvation." Here we have plainly a certainty of election or salvation which is conditional on the perseverance in faith made possible by God's grace for every man, which, however, is infallible on this one condition only, and which we have always accepted, and at the beginning of the controversy at once declared in unmistakable terms. Only such a certainty is known to the Scriptures (Matth. 10, 22; 24, 13: "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved"—this evidently is not a mere description of those who will finally be saved; it is above all the condition on which alone any one can be saved). Only such a certainty is taught by our Confessions (compare, for instance, the seventh of the well-known eight points: "That the good work which He has begun in them He would strengthen, increase and support to the end, if" (wenn, Latin: si modo: if only) "they observe God's Word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness and faithfully use the gifts received").

But the Report pretends that it has found at least one dogmatician agreeing with it in opposing this conditional certainty, namely, Quenstedt. It quotes the following words from this teacher of the Church (p. 84): "God desires the salvation of all men, however, not on the condition of faith, 'if they would believe'; also not absolutely, but according to a fixed order of means. This will of God is therefore not an absolute will, but a will according to an order, by no means, however, (to speak exactly) a conditional will, as the Hypothetics among the Calvinists claim. For that which is absolute is the opposite not only of that which is hypothetical or conditional, but also of that which is ordered and fixed by a certain order (τάξει)." And to this the Report adds the remark: "This must be well noted. For if we had a conditional certainty of our election, we would have none at all." And thus good old Quenstedt has become an ally of modern Missouri for all who simply believe the statements of the Report without reflection and research of their own. But only for

such. For whoever looks for himself will find that here again there is nothing but semblance, and that too a semblance produced entirely by the most manifest distortion and falsification. If the Report had not omitted but given the beginning and the end of this passage from Quenstedt, then every one would have seen at once that this passage does not at all treat of election or of the certainty of election! The beginning reads thus: "The antecedent will" (i. e. the universal will of salvation), "although, to speak properly, it is not absolute, is still truly and absolutely universal; for it embraces all men jointly and severally, since God wants the salvation of all men, yet not, etc." Immediately preceding these words we read: "We admit that the covenant promises, promising us salvation under the New Testament, are conditional, or include the condition of faith; but we must distinguish between the antecedent and the subsequent will. In the antecedent will this condition is not taken into consideration, but this is done in the subsequent will which promises salvation only to believers, or, on the condition of faith in Christ." And the closing words read as follows: "Hence when the antecedent will is called a conditional will by some orthodox teachers, the word 'conditional' is not taken in its exact meaning (κυρίως), but in the sense that God does not want the salvation of all absolutely, but in a certain order, namely in this order, that they repent and believe in Christ; yet not in the sense of the Calvinists, as though God desires only conditionally (the salvation of all), if they all would believe, but does not desire that all may believe, but only, according to His absolute pleasure, that the elect alone may believe." What, therefore, Quenstedt here says concerning the universal way of salvation against the doctrine of the Reformed Hypothetics or Amyraldists, to whose views modern Missouri has great resemblance (compare above p. 37), this the Report quotes in the most perfidious way against the opponents of modern Missouri and obscures the actual point at issue by mutilating Quenstedt's words! But the Report is very careful not to inform its readers what Quenstedt says on predestination in other places. It is silent about what Quenstedt says only a few pages following the mutilated quotation given above (Cap. II. sect. 1, thes. 14.), where he himself calls election, which, according to his own doctrine, as well as according to that of all our dogmaticians, is deduced from the subsequent will, a hypothetical or conditional election, for he appropriates the words of Hülsemann:

"It thus belongs to the form of predestination that it is hypothetical, or founded upon a condition, which is indeed fulfilled by the grace of God, and can in no way be fulfilled by the natural powers of man. However, this condition is of such a character that man is able to prevent its fulfillment, and it is often prevented by nature, yet by virtue of prevenient grace, which is common to all hearers of the Word, this prevention may be avoided." And Quenstedt adds: "We therefore teach that this foreseeing of the fact that prevenient grace will not be prevented belongs altogether to the essence of predestination (prævisionem igitur non impediendæ prævenientis gratiæ formam prædestinationis omnnio ingredi statuimus)." The Report also conceals that Quenstedt in another place of his treatise on predestination (Cap. II. sec. 2. quæst. 7.) declares the following: "All expressions which promise the continuance of the covenant of God made with those who are justified, as Is. 54, 10; Jer. 32, 38; Hos. 2, 19; 1 Cor. 1, 8; Phil. 1, 6, are to be understood as conditional; for the covenant of God is not absolute, but conditional, and demands that on the part of man faith and piety shall follow. When these fail to appear, the covenant is broken, not on the part of God who never changes, Mal. 3, 6, but on the part of men, who do not fulfill the condition and do not use the means prescribed by God." From these passages, to which dozens might yet be added, saying the same thing, everybody can see on which side Quenstedt stands when he says that the certainty of election is not exactly conditional, but is an ordered certainty, i. e. bound to a certain order and dependent upon the observance of this order; for he evidently means by "ordered" the very thing other dogmaticians and we mean by "conditional." And he who can say that election itself is hypothetical or conditional can surely also say the same of the certainty of election. Hence it is nothing but deception when Quenstedt is quoted against us and in favor of modern Missouri.

In conclusion, the following passages may show how inconsiderate and conscienceless the Report speaks at times in its efforts to ridicule the standpoint of the "opponents," which it has already distorted, and how it then contradicts itself where it speaks considerately and conscientiously. Thus we read on page 95: "According to the definition of the word faith, Heb. 11, 1, a Christian is concerned not merely with present blessings, namely with the forgiveness of sin and with the gracious will of God, but also with future blessings, and this in such a way that he knows that

these will not fail him. David even in the Old Testament was certain that he would not be put to shame in his hope. How much more should we be thus certain! Ships on the sea indeed have anchors, but they are not always firm. The Christian, however, has an anchor that is firm, so that his vessel cannot sink. Therefore a Christian should glory in the hope of eternal life, as we also confess in the Third Article, that we believe not only a forgiveness of sin, but also an eternal life. This does not mean to say that, I believe that other people will obtain it, but that I will obtain it; that it is given to me, and that it will remain mine to all eternity. Our opponents indeed assert that the word 'I believe' must here be understood in a twofold sense, first as 'having with certainty,' thus in regard to the forgiveness of sins, of which I am to be certain in faith; then as 'having conditionally,' thus in regard to eternal life. But reflect a moment! If this were so we would have to say to our children when instructing them: Now be very careful! The first you must believe with certainty, the second, however, by no means with certainty; for here the word believe has a different meaning. But this is folly. Moreover, we are to hold fast to the profession of our hope. But that is an extraordinary profession, when I confess the articles of faith, and then when the world asks me: Will you get to heaven with your religion? I answer: Well, that I don't know. Then we would confess that we are not much better off than the heathen." This wild speech, reminding one strongly of certain politicians in our country, is refuted not only by the passages quoted above from Quenstedt, but also by another more sober passage from the Report itself (p. 73). We read here: "This indeed is the simplest faith of children that if I believe in Christ I shall be saved. But, to be sure, we are here concerned with something still lying in the future. That I am in grace now" (=have forgiveness of sin) "this I know with absolute certainty; for I have this now. But whether I will certainly be saved depends on my remaining in faith and not falling back into the service of sin and unbelief; yet I believe firmly and certainly" (but do not know with absolute certainty) "that God will keep me in faith and holiness. And this is the whole difference." It seems to us that this difference is great enough and shows clearly that the other speech is only empty talk. Every "opponent" agrees with the statement quoted last.

III.

THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

D. "ALTES UND NEUES" AND "LEHRE UND WEHRE" BEFORE THE GENERAL PASTORAL CONFERENCE AT CHICAGO IN THE AUTUMN OF 1890.

"The same conviction that I entertained had been produced by the Report of '79 in Prof. Schmidt, namely that now a public testimony must be made. But while had concluded to publish and send out to all pastors merely a single pamphlet, he had resolved to publish a periodical. The first number of this periodical was issued in January, 1880, four months after the disgraceful Synod of '79; and this shows what must be thought of the assertion of those at St. Louis, when they declare so emphatically that Schmidt had begun the controversy because he was embittered by the synodical meeting in May, 1878." This is what Rev. Allwardt writes in his "Zeugnis", to which reference has already been made. Let us hear now what the chief champion of truth in the controversy, Prof. F. A. Schmidt, declared concerning his position and motives in the preface to Vol. I. of his periodical "Altes und Neues."

"There is a very special reason for issuing 'Altes und Neues' just at this time. In the Missouri Synod, which is looked upon, and not without reason, as the standard-bearer of our Synodical Conference, there has been fully set forth and defended during recent years a doctrine of predestination which we cannot but regard as a Calvinizing error contrary to the Scriptures and the Confession. More or less distinct beginnings of this false doctrine are indeed found in part already earlier. In the last two Reports of the Western District (1877 and 1879), however, this doctrine which we are firmly convinced is false, has reached its full development. Moreover, the Report of 1879 has publicly branded all those who hitherto opposed the new doctrine in the private circles of brethren as opponents of the Missouri Synod, as rationalists who make God a liar, as dangerous errorists, and

heretics; and has in addition dared to misrepresent and distort their position in various ways, and has also made hostile attacks upon them. No one will, therefore, think evil of us, if we as one of these opponents declare this sentence of condemnation to be unjust, and attempt to defend our Lutheranism to the best of our ability. Even aside from the decided anathema already pronounced upon us, we certainly do not think we exceed our rights in now sounding the alarm against the false doctrine which is publicly set forth and maintained. By its official declaration of war, however, the Report of 1879 has made our task considerably easier, and by breaking off the private negotiations so far carried on has challenged us to open battle. Be it so. In God's name let us have open and decisive war against this new Cryto-Calvinism, which imagines that it alone is entitled to acceptance, and exerts all its powers to hold the ground it has already won and to gain more." (P. 1 sq.)—"Those who know with what love we have hitherto been attached to the Missouri Synod as our church home and, recognizing her cause to be as a whole God's cause, have made it our own and defended it to the best of our abilities, will believe us that in now stepping into the ranks against her we are not impelled by any carnal love of opposition. We fear that we have been silent too long already, and have attempted too long to put the best construction on every thing. But as Ecclesiastes says: There is 'a time to keep silence, and a time to speak'. Moreover, we on our part desire to conduct the controversy, if possible, without personal attacks, although in our opposition against this false doctrine we find ourselves compelled to set aside considerations, which under other circumstances we have always endeavored to regard to the best of our ability and conscience. We now appreciate more keenly than ever the weight of the well-known saying: Amicus Plato, amicus Socrates, sed magis amica veritas (Plato is my friend, Socrates is my friend, but truth is still more my friend). Luther writes concerning this: 'Aristotle has well and finely said it is better to assent to truth than to adhere too firmly to those who love us and are our friends. And it especially behooves a philosopher to do this; for when both love us, truth and a friend, we should prefer truth to the friend and esteem it more highly. If now a heathen urges us to do this in worldly things, how much more should it be done in those things which have the public testimony of Scripture, that we may not prefer the authority of men to the Holy Scriptures. For men

may err; but God's Word is the wisdom of God Himself and the most assured truth.' (Walch 1, 221.)—And so far as the offense is concerned which may be occasioned by the present controversy with reference to an important portion of the treasure of pure doctrine, it is plain that they are to be charged with it who disturb the Church with new and pernicious errors and have already brought the controversy into pulicity. At any rate, God's Word is of more importance than human fears. 'Melius est ut scandalum oriatur, quam ut veritas amittatur (it is better for an offense to arise than for the truth to be lost). May God in His mercy give the victory to truth. Amen."

Only a blind, fanatical partisan, or a thorough-going unionist, could object to the spirit manifested in these words and call it fanatical, selfish, or vindictive. To be sure, we too thought at first that Prof. Schmidt should have waited with his public attack upon Missouri and its universally revered leader, Dr. Walther, and should have tried still other means. It still seemed to us that the matter should not be considered so grave as Prof. Schmidt considered it, and that the Calvinizing utterances that had been made should at least be charitably interpreted and excused in accordance with the Lutheran sentiments accompanying them, although they could not be justified and approved. In reply to repeated inquiries as to our position in regard to the whole sad occurrence, especially in regard to Prof. Schmidt's procedure, we gave the answer, that we agreed perfectly with his thesis, only half with his antithesis, and not at all with his mode of controversy. And this was said in fullest sincerity because of our gratitude, still unshaken in spite of many a bitter experience, and our attachment to the Missouri Synod, and especially to the man who was the soul of this Synod, Dr. Walther. But we have since learned to understand the correctness of Prof. Schmidt's insight and judgment, and have thanked God and thank Him to-day that He gave Prof. Schmidt the discernment, the courage, and the strength to stand up as he did. For this brought the matter to a crisis, and compelled the Semi-Calvinism of modern Missouri, instead of hiding in the dark and gradually gaining entrance everywhere through Dr. Walther's authority and skill, to come out publicly and to show itself openly as a departure from what had been considered genuine Lutheranism by friend and by foe for now 300 years. It attracted the attention of all to this new departure of Missouri, gave to every one an opportunity, and in fact compelled

him, to examine it carefully according to the Scriptures and the Confessions, and take a stand in regard to it. This is Dr. Schmidt's merit, which can neither be taken from him or curtailed, although we may not appropriate all his expressions, for instance the term "Crypto-Calvinism" (secret Calvinism) which was so much resented, and yet is perfectly applicable when rightly understood, for which, however, we prefer to use Semi-Calvinism (a half-way Calvinism).

In the second number of "Altes und Neues" appeared an article from the pen of Rev. Allwardt, the first man who stood up publicly among the members of the Missouri Synod against the new doctrine. To mark the spirit in which he did this, we here quote the beginning and the end of his article:

"The undersigned finds himself compelled by conscience to utter a protest also on his part against the statement of the doctrine of predestination in various publications of the honorable Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and adjacent states, especially in the last two Reports of the meetings of the Western District. After two years of conscientious examination, with at first the one object of finding an agreement between this statement and the Scriptures and the Confession of our Church, I have come to the firm conviction that a far-reaching innovation is here found, an innovation which touches very closely the foundation of faith, namely the universality of the grace of God in Christ; and besides this also the operation of the means of grace, and other parts of the doctrines of salvation. It will be clear to all that, having this conviction, I dare not be silent. But that I would be compelled to give public testimony in this way, I myself did not believe till the last Report of the Western District Synod came into my hands. I am a member of the Synod and no discontented member, as all who have known me for the last fifteen years can testify. The differences in doctrine which have arisen are not an occasion for me to give vent to some secret spite. The Synod has never offended me, has always treated me kindly and well--more so than I will ever be able to repay, except it be by this earnest warning against great danger. I thus at first intended to show up the error only in the most considerate way, namely before the Pastoral Conference, and finally perhaps before the assembled Synod. After I had expressed my doubts to the General President in the spring of 1879, I laid them before the Pastoral Conference at the close of the sessions of the Northwestern District Synod in Milwaukee, and at first pointed

out only one sentence in the Northern Report of 1871, partly because I myself am a member of this District, and partly because in this sentence lies the germ of the entire development which fills 190 pages of the last two Reports of the Western District. The Conference directed me to state my doubts in writing for its next session in the fall and to send a circular letter containing them to the members of the Conference beforehand. This I did, and the Conference then too devoted nearly all of its time to this matter. The meeting was quite animated, but not essentially more so than was usually the case. I had declared at the very outset that I considered the doctrinal error that had been taught to be indeed very dangerous, yet that I would neither try to force matters nor raise needless disturbance about them. I would be content to wait five or ten years, if only the subject were treated seriously. We reached no conclusion at this meeting, and it was resolved to take up the subject again in the following year.—At the time the Oshkosh Conference met, the Western District Synod also convened in St. Louis; and here, as the Report shows, the matter was made public. But, alas, in what way? In the beginning of the Report we indeed read: 'The matter having been treated so incompletely (in 1877), it was easy, especially for a reader who had not been present at our discussion, to find many dark and enigmatical, and even perhaps dangerous things therein'. But this kindly way of judging of our opposition soon made way to the worst possible temper and at the same time to grave misrepresentations of our objections. 'These people want to call us to account on the ground that we teach a false doctrine of predestination. But they have no doctrine of predestination at all.' 'It looks as if these were bright heads and humble spirits who speak thus; but it only looks so.' 'The apostles were no such rationalists as to think that the certainty of election does away with watching.' 'What a bad sign, that our opponents have not only the papists, but among them also such a cunning and astute supporter for their doctrine as this Bellarmin is!' 'They say, when according to God's Word a Christian is to work out his salvation with fear and trembling, he is to do this with the thought: You can and perhaps will be lost; therefore work hard that you may not be condemned; for it all depends upon this that you work real hard.' 'But according to our opponents we are to think that it is still an open question whether we will get to heaven or to hell. No; here we part company.' . . . There are many more such uncharitable utterances.

In fact the Report at last calls upon all openly to take sides! 'He, therefore, who would believe God's Word, let him come to our side; and he who would make the thing plausible to his reason, let him join those who deny the certainty of election. But, indeed, how will they fare who make God out a liar.' This then is the war-cry of the brethren of the Western District! What now are we to do? Wait for further oral discussion? This would be hopeless; for after such prejudice has been awakened against us, and among many it will take root only too quickly, who will be left to make an impartial examination? All who have not made themselves thoroughly conversant with the questions at issue will be very much inclined to conclude from the Western Report that terrible heresies lie at the bottom of our views, even though they cannot as yet clearly see them. Besides it is so much easier to compel the disturbers to keep still or to show them the door than to refute them fairly, especially if such a refutation is an impossibility. While such fruitless attempts at coming to an understanding orally would be under way, the errors that really exist on the other side would strike deeper root. Those who in reality do not sympathize with them would give a convenient interpretation to the words and accomodate themselves to them; in favorable soil, however, they would soon become so strong and powerful that afterwards all warnings would be too late . . . May no one interpret my daring to attack this subject and attacking it so boldly, as enmity, or pride, or anything of the kind. The affair has worried me now for two years. I know full well what I risk in making such an attack. But I also know that I would have to become a cowardly traitor to the Lutheran Church and to the Confessions to which I have sworn to adhere, if I should take into consideration the dangers to my position, and for this reason be silent, or speak as though I were not in earnest. God be merciful to us all for the sake of His dear Son. Amen." (P. 27 sqq.)

And now what did Dr. Walther do? "Prof. Schmidt had sent his papers only to pastors and teachers. He did not want to hurl the controversy among the congregations. Dr. Walther, however, answered in the 'Lutheraner'. 'That is a fine move (as in chess)' said some one at the time who seems to know the Dr. pretty well, 'he now intends to work up the congregations as quickly as possible.' True enough. And how did he begin! Not by stating the real point in question and by defending the sentences attacked by us. He formulated entirely new theses,

most of them altogether correct, while the controverted questions are touched upon so ambiguously that they can be understood in either way. Moreover, Dr. Walther came out already at this time with the public falsehood, that the question in this controversy was whether our salvation lay alone in God's hand, or whether it lay also in our own hand! As long, and only as long as he manages to keep up this deception will he have the success about which alone he seems to be concerned." ("Zeugnis", p. 238.)—These new theses we will mention again.

But also in "Lehre und Wehre", the theological monthly of the Missouri Synod, the agitation was begun. The February number of 1880 already brought the first installment of a long article extending through five numbers, from the pen of Dr. Walther himself: "Dogmengeschichtliches über die Lehre vom Verhältnis des Glaubens zur Gnadenwahl" (Dogmatico-historical Data on the Doctrine Concerning the Relation of Faith to Election). In this article Dr. Walther tries to prove, in the first place, what no man conversant with the subject ever doubted, namely, that "our most important later theologians, especially since Ægidius Hunnius, have followed a different τρόπος παιδείας" (Lehrtropus, mode of doctrine) "in the doctrine concerning the relation of faith to election than Luther, Rhegius, and Chemnitz followed" (p. 65). With evident satisfaction he tells us how the former did not always use the same terms to designate their standpoint, and how that acute theologian of Jena, Johann Musæus, criticizes the terms used by others to show that they are not altogether satisfactory. Dr. Walther here speaks even of a 'difference" in the "doctrine itself", which he thinks is found between the theologians named, "as it always betrays a difference in the thing itself" when no general term can be found or agreed upon for that which is ostensibly believed in common (?). And yet he prints the introductory sentence of Musæus, though not, as so much else suited to his purpose, in italics: "In the article concerning predestination the theologians of our Church agree with one accord, and teach unanimously over against the Calvinists, that the decree of predestination is not absolute, but as we in time are justified and saved πίστει, fide" (by faith), "Rom. 3, 28, διὰ πίστεως, per fidem" (by means of faith), "and ἐκ πίστεως, ex fide" (out of faith), "Rom. 3, 11; Gal. 2, 16; Eph. 2, 8, so God also from eternity, in view of forseen faith (intuitu prævisæ fidei) has chosen and ordained unto eternal life all who in time will be justified and

saved by faith. Herein, we say, all orthodox theologians on our side are united." (P. 49 sq.) From this, at any rate, it can be seen what Musæus took to be the fundamental and chief difference between Calvinists and Lutherans on this point. Dr. Walther also does not as yet dare to accuse him and all our leading theologians since the Formula of Concord outright of teaching false doctrine, although the assertion referred to above, concerning the difference in the doctrine itself, seems to point in this direction, and, if taken strictly, must lead to this. On the contrary, he still asserts: "They were far from attempting to change in any way the pure biblical and symbolical doctrine of predestination by the questionable term 'intuitu fidei'. Far from any such thought, they held fast to this doctrine with all earnestness, and rejected every Pelagian and synergistic idea in the doctrine of predestination." (P. 98.)

Evidently Dr. Walther in this article intended to discredit as much as possible that formulation of the doctrine, concerning an election in view of faith, which had hitherto been used in the Lutheran Church, at least since the Formula of Concord, almost exclusively, and to gain for his formulation of the doctrine, concerning an election unto faith, which for centuries had been taught almost exclusively by the Calvinists, tolerance at least within the Lutheran Church of America. He therefore says concerning his "opponents": "Even though these continue to regard and declare that type of doctrine to be questionable which makes faith flow from election and does not in signo rationis (in idea) make it precede election, and though they suppose it might lead the careless into Calvinism, and therefore repudiate it as liable to misconstruction: this gives them no right at all to berate those who use this type of doctrine as one altogether in harmony with the Scriptures, and no right to call them heretics, i. e. crypto-Calvinists; just as little as these have the right to call those heretics, i. e. Pelagians and synergists, who hold fast to the 'intuitu fidei' and to the doctrine that faith in signo rationis 'precedes' the decree of election; that is, if these at the same time hold fast in full earnestness to the doctrine of the Bible and Confession describing election as an act of grace, and repudiate positively and condemn heartily every Pelagian and synergistic idea of an election conditioned on man's activity." He declares, as regards himself and his like-minded friends, that "they hereby hold fast with all earnestness the doctrine of the Bible and the Confessions of an ordered elec-

tion, and positively repudiate and heartily condemn every Calvinistic notion of an absolute predestination." He agrees with Hülsemann in this that "the object in the divine predestination is the future believer, or he of whom God has foreseen that he would believe, that he would believe, however, through the grace of Him who has foreseen him, and this an efficacious grace." He thus does not consider the object of election to be man without regard to his faith. On the other hand, he rejects as Calvinism "the decree, that the efficacious or irresistible grace depends upon the sole or absolute pleasure of God, according to which He has determined absolutely and without any other cause not to give to others, that is to most men, this kind of grace." And here it "seems" to him "lies the point from which an understanding might be reached with those who are wrapped up neither in Calvinistic nor synergistic views." (P. 98 sq.) Would that he had acted according to these words before this and later on! Then at least would this lamentable doctrinal controversy have arisen through no fault of his. But we have only to compare what has been set forth in the preceding parts of this work, and what is quoted in the present section from the Reports of the Western District for '77 and '79 to see the great difference between what the "opponents" found objectionable and attacked in them, and what is here said by Dr. Walther; and this just as much as regards the doctrinal position, as also the treatment accorded to the "opponents". The appearance of "Altes und Neues", the proof of an independence and frankness hitherto altogether unknown in the Missouri Synod and the Synodical Conference, at first evidently awakened a feeling of uncertainty and anxiety in St. Louis, and for this reason it was thought best to assume a milder tone. But how entirely right they were who did not permit this to divert them from their purely objective contention against the manifest standpoint of modern Missouri, was apparent from what soon followed. For "Lehre und Wehre" now brought one article after another attempting to show that the doctrine hitherto universally taught in the Lutheran Church was contrary to the Scriptures and the Confessions; and these attempts were made with increasing boldness.

Already in the March number of this periodical for the same year, we find, immediately after the continuation of Dr. Walther's article, a communication from Prof. A. L. Gräbner, at that time still a member of the Wisconsin Synod, attempting to controvert

the assertion of Quenstedt made in harmony with the rest of our old dogmaticians, and regarded as a fundamental position of faithful Lutherunism, viz: "Consequently προγνωσις" (foreknowing, Rom. 8, 29) "is not election. This must be noted against the Calvinists." And he also defends the sentence from the Report of '77 (p. 37): "Election and foresight is one and the same thing." Compare with this what has been quoted above as the former doctrine of Missouri, from the pen of Rev. Fürbringer and of Dr. Walther (p. 56 sqq.; 65).

In the May number we find an article by Rev. Stöckhardt, "written at the request of the St. Louis Pastoral Conference", in which as his theme he answers the question: "Does the Formula of Concord teach an 'election in the wider sense'?" negatively. He admits and even asserts outright and positively: "In §§ 13-24" (Jacobs' Transl. of the Symbol. Books p. 652 sq.) "is given a complete definition" (vollständige Begriffsbestimmung) "of the eternal election of God" (p. 139; compare p. 140: "From the foregoing division of the 11th article it is apparent in which part we must look especially for the definition of election, namely in the passage § 13-24"). In spite of this he tries to prove from the Confession itself that it does not, as we assume with our old authorities in the Church (compare above p. 39 sqq.), teach an election in the wider sense. Indeed these very §§, especially the "introduction", §§ 13 and 14, and the "concluding clause", §§ 23 and 24, in his opinion, show this clearly. And how does he seek to make this plausible? By undertaking to demonstrate from the passages quoted in § 14, Rom. 8, and Eph. 1, which he takes as treating "only of God's counsel regarding the elect", and not "of universal redemption, vocation, and justification" (compare for the interpretation of these passages "Theologische Zeitblätter" Vol. III., p. 328 sqq., 1884), that the Confession speaks in this paragraph only of the elect, or of the way "upon which God has resolved to lead the elect." It is very significant that the third passage quoted by the Confession, namely Matt. 22, 1 sqq., is altogether disregarded, as it would overthrow the whole pretended demonstration, since it evidently treats of the way of salvation in so far as it exists for all men! But is it not, to begin with, a clear proof for the anti-Biblical and anti-confessional character of the modern Missourian doctrine of election, when in its definition it cannot use this fundamental passage of Scripture, which Chemnitz for instance always puts into the very first place (compare

"Zeitblätter" III., 333 sqq., and especially Chemnitz, Enchiridion, printed in Frank's "Theologie der Konkordienformel", IV., 327 sqq., and republished by A. L. Gräbner, G. Brumder, Milwaukee, 1886), but must pass it by in silence? By this perversion of the introduction, §§ 13 and 14, naturally all that follows also comes to have a false and perverted appearance. These paragraphs are said to contain nothing but "an explicit and complete declaration and enumeration of the acts of God's will in regard to the elect." §15 and 21 are especialy submitted to a process of twisting and quibbling, so as to make them agree with the above assertion. Indeed, even the Enchiridion of Chemnitz, the basis of Article XI. of the Formula of Concord, is called upon to prove the correctness of the interpretation given. But Rev. Stöckhardt is very careful not to quote the passages from the Enchiridion cited by us above (p. 47 sq.), since these give the clearest possible testimony against his misinterpretation of the Confession, and prove conclusively also that the words in § 23, "prepared salvation . . . in general", designate the universal way of salvation for all men, and not for the elect alone.—The result of Rev. Stöckhardt's investigation is the following: "We see that all talk of an 'election in the wider sense' taught in the Formula of Concord, is only a human figment which vanishes when submitted to the clear, precise words of the Confession." Indeed, fine "clear, precise words", obtained by merely omitting what clearly contradicts them, and by perverting the rest! In this way a man could prove anything. Besides, Rev. Stöckhardt falsely imputes to those who teach an election in the wider sense the folly of speaking about a "choice which is said to concern all men", and then proceeds with great superciliousness to talk about a "contradictio in adjecto", an "impossibility", and "a self-contradictory idea." Is it possible that he did not know what has been understood for now 300 years in the Lutheran Church by "election in the wider sense", namely not a self-contradictory "choice of all men unto salvation", but, for one thing, the choice and institution of the universal way of salvation, and for another, the choice of those persons who, according to the foreknowledge of God, will permit themselves to be led upon this universal way of salvation unto salvation (compare above p. 48 sqq.)? If he did not know this, he should not attempt to controvert and ridicule what he does not know. If he did know it, how could he in honesty speak as he did?—"The eternal election of God is the wonderful mystery hovering over

certain persons"—this is what our Confession teaches according to Rev. Stöckhardt (p. 147).

This same Missourian champion has also attempted to bring in "Lehre und Wehre" the modern Missourian "Scripture proof for the doctrine of election" (p. 176 sqq.). Of course, we cannot discuss this whole matter here, but must refer our readers to what has been said in former volumes of the "Theologische Zeitblätter" (for instance, Vol. I., 21 sqq.; 93 sqq.; III., 321 sqq.; VIII., 80 sqq.). Only a few things, necessarily belonging to the "history and proper estimate" of the controversy on predestination, can here receive our attention.

First of all, Rev. Stöckhardt of course attempts to demonstrate that the meaning of the words προγινώσκειν and πρόγνωσις (foreseeing or foreknowing), as held for 300 years in opposition to the Reformed view, is incorrect, and that the Reformed meaning of these words is correct, as Prof. Gräbner (p. 73 sqq.) and Dr. Walther (p. 129 sqq.) had already attempted. And in this he claims to have "the very latest and, as universally acknowledged, the most weighty linguists" on his side. As such he names von Hofmann, Cremer, and Grimm. It is peculiar to begin with that Hofmann is here placed above Meyer and Philippi, that Hofmann, who, in spite of much that is suggestive in his work, often as regards the language, goes to work in his exegesis, more arbitrarily than any other exegete, as Rev. Stöckhardt himself (p. 183) on one occasion, where Hofmann did not happen to agree with him, accuses him: "Hofmann emancipates himself from all rules of language." Grimm, however, explains γινώσκω by, "acknowledging a person worthy of one's company or love," which explanation Rev. Stöckhardt, of course, has to twist and alter in its essential features before it can be utilized for his purpose. And thus Cremer alone remains, who indeed is an authority in the field of Biblical philology of the New Testament. In what he says on προγινώσκειν he indeed appears, at least in part, to agree with Rev. Stöckhardt, and with modern Missouri in general. For he takes προγνώσκειν as a synonym of ἐκλέγεσθαι, and this as a term for "the union of God with the objects of the counsel of salvation, which union is established already in this counsel and therefore exists already before its consummation"; it "includes essentially a self-determination of God toward this communion." But at the same time he refers back to the simple form γινώσκω, according to which προγινώσκω must be interpreted. And how

does he explain the former? "Not infrequently γινώσκειν in New Testament Greek designates a personal relation of the intelligent subject to the object cognized, as much as being determined by the cognition of an object, permitting oneself to be determined thereby, namely in that something is cognized in so far as it is of importance for the person cognizing it, influencing him, and thus calling out on the part of the cognizing subject a certain relation to the object cognized." "To understand the single expressions both must be held fast, that in γινώσκειν is brought out the importance of the object cognized for him cognizing it, and at the same time the determining influence proceeding from the object to the subject. The positive γινώσκειν τινά signifies that the basis of a union, and with it at once the union itself, exits, that the object is not alien to the subject, but well-known to it, i. e. intimate with it." Cremer, therefore, takes the word spoken of quite like Grimm, i. e. he takes as a basis and point of departure for that which is designated by it, a real cognition, or, as it may be, a precognition, thus an act of the intellect, more particularly of the omniscience of God. And we can be satisfied with this explanation; for this does not really say more than our old teachers who speak of a cognoscere cum affectu et effectu, i. e. of a cognition combined with an energetic love; only Cremer lays more stress upon this accompanying love, which also in his opinion results from the cognition, than upon the cognition itself which in thought precedes the love as its source and cause, while our old teachers, in opposition to the Calvinistic absolute predestination, generally did the opposite (compare "Zeitblätter" III., p. 325 sqq.). Thus the "weighty linguist" Cremer does not at all favor the modern Missourian view. Indeed, this cannot be claimed with certainty even of Hofmann. For not only does he declare that choosing in advance is "an idea far removed from γινώσκειν" (Romans, p. 348), but he also understands by προγινώσκειν "an act which directs itself in an appropriating manner to the object cognized before its existence, making it in advance an object of cognition, as one cognizes what is akin or of the same nature as oneself"; and he here rejects only a cognition which is "nothing but a mere knowing of the object cognized, or a perception of its nature", since "real cognition is an act of appropriation aiming at acquaintance with things akin." Perhaps he means the same thing as Cremer; at least his words can so be understood.

In this discussion of Eph. 1, 4 we read (p. 230): "Election

is in so far mediated by Christ, the Redeemer, as Christ by His redemption and His merit has made it possible for God at all to elect sinful men. We are chosen in Christ, through Christ, for Christ's sake. This is what St. Paul teaches, and nothing more. If we were to add to the words 'in Christ' the further words 'inasmuch as He is our own through faith, inasmuch as God has foreseen faith in Christ', this addition would be an unwarranted gloss, just as the exegesis' 'us who are in Christ', which puts in a thought not revealed in the Scriptures themselves. We would do violence to the Scriptures, and mix the clear utterances of the Holy Spirit with human opinions, if we would try to deduce and to demostrate this theory of God's foreseeing faith from the Scriptures. The Scriptures neither here nor elsewhere say a word of this. Of course, according to the Scriptures faith belongs to the order of election—this order rightly understood. We shall see in the discussion of theses 6 and 7 that God included faith in His eternal counsel of predestination; that, when He chose us unto salvation, He at the same time determined to save us only by faith, and in no other way, and to bring us unto saving faith. We too protest against having faith excluded from the eternal election and predestination of God. But we deny that the Scriptures regard faith as foreseen and place it as a premise prior to election. This is and remains a human thought against which the language of the Scriptures rebels." This is certainly clear and precise, but just as certainly an open abandonment of the Lutheran position for the past 300 years over against the Reformed, and an acceptance of the position of the latter on this point.

On page 232 we read: "The Scriptures exclude all consideration of man's conduct in that they describe the election or predestination of God as a free act of God's will grounded only in God Himself, in Christ." It is singular that modern Missouri bases the election, as the choice or selection of certain persons in preference to others, upon Christ, and does this without God's having seen or regarded in this choice whether these persons would receive Christ's merits in faith, or not. Can Christ and His merit, inasmuch as it exists for all, and for all in the same way, be a reason for this choice or selection? Here surely is a real "contradictio in adjecto," an "impossibility," a "self-contradictory idea." Evidently an election "in Christ" does not at all fit into the modern Missourian system, which as to its basis and main tendency is none other than that of the Calvinists, and in reality

takes Christ's redemption only as a means for carrying out the choice which also precedes it in thought, as it does this outspokenly with faith and justification. In the interpretation of 2 Thess. 2, 13 (compare "Zeitblätter" I, 93 sqq.) we read: "We shall therefore proceed more safely, if we forsake the interpretation 'unto sanctification of the Spirit and unto belief of the truth,'" contrary to the Report of '77 (above p. 74 sq.); but in a roundabout way the same sense is reached which, however, in spite of all the trouble taken is not established as lying necessarily in the words. On page 271 we read: "Thesis 6 has shown that God has predestinated us unto faith, unto adoption, unto justification, that God, when in eternity He chose us unto everlasting life, has at the same time determined to sanctify us by His Spirit, and to bring us unto faith, and thus to lead us through faith unto salvation. From this it follows of itself that God, when now in time He sanctifies us by His Spirit, calls us, converts us, i. e. makes us believe, justifies us, thereby carries out His decree of predestination; that our vocation, conversion, justification, as well as our salvation is a necessary result of our election, resting upon the latter." According to this it seems as though we would have to say of every believer that he is one of the elect; for the faith wrought in time is called in a general way "a necessary result of predestination," and described as a carrying out of this predestination. On page 280 the following is set forth as "clear Scripture doctrine": "The eternal election and predestination of God is a cause, and that too the ultimate cause as well of our salvation, as also of all that pertains to our salvation, of our vocation, of our justification, of our faith, of our perseverance." So then, let it be well noted, that not God's universal love for sinners without exception is the real and ultimate cause when a sinner believes and is saved, but the particular grace of election which from the start, without any regard to man's conduct, embraces only comparatively few! Can every poor sinner truly and without self-deception rejoice at this, and comfort himself with the thought that he too can be saved, as long as being saved does not depend upon what is given for all, but upon what in its nature and purpose and from the start is intended only for a few? Is this not again a real contradictio in adjecto? Assuredly it is. But that same Rev. Stöckhardt who, where it suits him, so abhors a contradictio in adjecto, must acknowledge one here, unless he would abandon his entire modern Missourian system, or acknowledge

that he here teaches the completest Calvinism. And so in his 11th thesis (p. 306 sq.) he directs him who is in trouble about his election, to "the universal Gospel of Christ," from which, according to his doctrine, the choice of those who alone and infallibly will be saved does not at all follow, which with its universal love of God proclaimed unto all sinners is not at all the last and ultimate foundation of salvation. "And thus we are to know our election from the Gospel. It is true, also the non-elect, those who believe for a time, hear the Gospel. But we reject as a speculation of reason this conclusion, that because also unbelievers, persistent rejectors, and temporary believers hear this Gospel, therefore one cannot with certainty be convinced of his election from the Gospel." But can we imagine a sober Christian, under the spell neither of fanaticism nor of egotism, who in all seriousness could draw this conclusion and comfort himself in real anxiety with the thought: As of all men to whom God in the Gospel proclaims forgiveness of sin, life, and salvation only the smallest number obtain persevering faith and therewith salvation, namely those who are chosen from among all mankind without the least regard to faith and conduct, according to a mysterious pleasure of God; and as I now belong to this whole number of mankind, and have also the beginning of faith: therefore I also belong surely and certainly to the small number of the elect? This certainly would be no "speculation of reason," but such evident nonsense and contradiction that one can hardly suppose a sensible man capable of it.

III.

THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

E. THE GENERAL PASTORAL CONFERENCE IN THE AUTUMN OF 1880.

"Whereas nothing has hitherto been done on the part of the Synodical Conference to settle the controversy that has arisen with reference to the doctrine of predestination; whereas, accordingly, nothing remains for us but to attempt to restore unity of doctrine at least in our own Synod; whereas, finally, circumstances also appear to make further delay unwise; therefore the undersigned, at the request of the Pastoral Conferences of Chicago and St. Louis assumes the responsibility of herewith inviting all pastors and professors, for the objects stated, to an extra meeting of the General Pastoral Conference, on the 29th of September of the present year, in the church of Rev. A. Wagner of Chicago, Ill." Thus began the introduction to the "Invitation" which "was issued by letter in September, 1880, to all the pastors and professors of the 'German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and adj. States,' signed by the General President of the Synod, Rev. H. C. Schwan. In answer to this invitation there assembled at the appointed time in Chicago "from the ministerium of the Missouri Synod 431, and from the laity of the Missouri Synod 20 persons, from the other Synods 16 persons," altogether according to the signatures received 467 persons. And the "remark" added to this enumeration in the published minutes tells us that: "These figures would be still higher if all present had complied with the request of the Conference and had entered their names in the lists presented for signature." Thus a mighty convention assembled, exceeded in numbers as well as in importance by few that have taken place within the church. Alas, that its results were not more satisfactory!

After conferring for a long time at the beginning of the proceedings about the course to be pursued in the discussion, it was finally resolved, especially at the instance of Dr. Walther "to

take up Article XI of the Formula of Concord for discussion," "since evidently the whole controversy has arisen from the different interpretations of the Formula of Concord, and since there is no one among us who does not mean to agree with the Confession." As to the first two paragraphs of the Confession all naturally at once found themselves in agreement: but in paragraphs 3 to 5 the difference between the two views represented in the Conference already began to come to the surface. Dr. Walther claimed that § 5 ("But the eternal election of God, or predestination, i.e. God's appointment to salvation, pertains not at the same time to the godly and the wicked, but only to the children of God, who were elected and appointed to eternal life before the foundation of the world was laid, as Paul says (Eph. 1, 4. 5.): 'He hath chosen us in Him, having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Christ Jesus") demonstrated "most clearly" "that the Formula of Concord speaks only of election in the so-called narrower sense" ("Verhandlungen der Allgemeinen Pastoralkonferenz über die Lehre von der Gnadenwahl" — Report of the General Pastoral Conference of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio and adj. States Concerning the Doctrine of Predestination. Chicago, Ill., from September 29 till October 5, 1880.—St. Louis, Mo., Concordia Publishing House, 1880. Page 13.) Thus already these introductory paragraphs which simply mean to warn the reader against confusing predestination with God's foresight and foreknowledge, and to state the difference between the two (see above p. 39 sq.), were to decide what the Confession understands and embraces by election, in contradiction to the clear line of thought in the Confession (see above p. 39-45) and to its interpretation by our most prominent theologians since the adoption of the Formula of Concord, for instance of Ægidius Hunnius (1550-1603) and Leonhard Hutter (1563-1616; see above p. 50 sqq.). Those members of the Conference, however, who were determined to adhere for conscience' sake to the view which for 300 years, that is at all times, had been in reality the only accepted view in the Lutheran Church, held fast likewise to the interpretation which had always prevailed in the Lutheran Church as being alone in harmony with the language and with the plain object of the Confession, namely that in §§ 13-24 the authentic statement is given of what is comprised in election, and in what sense election is here taken. The great majority of the Conference agreed from the outset with Dr. Walther, at least in this that his "opponents"

could not be right in disagreeing with him. It was humorous in one respect, and yet sad in another, to see how those who felt themselves compelled to speak in favor of Dr. Walther's position, set up the most contradictory statements as soon as they undertook to put something in place of the assertions of the "opponents." It was also significant that hardly one of these would-be champions of orthodoxy appeared to know what had been understood in the Lutheran Church for nearly 300 years by election in the wider sense; indeed, most of them spoke as if they naively believed that the wicked "opponents" had just invented this expression (compare above p. 116). One of them said: "If the distinction between a wider and a narrower election were right, we would have to say that even temporary believers are elected—something that certainly no one would assert," ("Verhandlungen, etc.," p. 20)—as though any man had ever spoken of a "wider and a narrower election," especially in the sense of this theologian. Another then claimed: "If election also includes the ordination of the means of grace, then pure Calvinism must be the outcome. Paragraph 5 says distinctly that predestination pertains only to those who are appointed unto eternal life. But if the choice of means were also included, this would say that the order of means also pertains only to the children of God" (p. 27). And even a professor in the St. Louis Seminary ventured to declare: "It is claimed on the one hand" (i. e. in his opinion, by the "opponents") "that election is chiefly the ordination of the means of grace which are intended for all men. This is said to be election in the wider sense. Again it is claimed that election embraces the persons who are saved. This is said to be election in the narrower sense. Here we evidently have two different elections" ("Verhandlungen, etc.," p. 24)—a plain demonstration that these two also did not, or would not, know what is understood by election in the wider sense, and how it is distinguished from election in the narrower sense, and this not merely since 1880, but for some 300 years, and not merely among the "opponents," but in the Lutheran Church generally.

At the end of the fourth session it was finally "resolved for the sake of the opponents to change the order that had been adopted, and to continue the discussion with § 13 sqq. But this must not be understood as if the "opponents" did not want to discuss or subscribe the previous §§. They simply protested against acknowledging §§ 3-5 as a definition of election in the sense of

the Confession, and against subscribing to these §§ with this understanding. They found this definition as did the old theologians in §§ 15-23. At the beginning of the next, the fifth, session the politic resolution was offered by one of the most eminent members of the Synod: "Let it be resolved, so as not to lengthen the discussion unnecessarily, that mainly those who have given the subject in hand thorough study, conduct the debate on either side. Hence Dr. Walther should speak chiefly on the one side." The gentleman had noticed that the seeming allies of Dr. Walther, partly by their contradictory statements, and partly by betraying the greatest ignorance concerning the subject in hand, only helped to hurt the cause they wished to aid. Dr. Walther did not formally accept the honor intended for him; but when the gentleman who had offered the resolution remarked that really no resolution was necessary, if only the discussion would be conducted as proposed, it was, of course, settled by his as well as Dr. Walther's authority that the speakers who were uncalled for, in more than one sense of the word, now withdrew from the discussion almost altogether, and left the defense of his position to Dr. Walther and a few of his St. Louis colleagues. Hereupon the "opponents" were requested, first of all, to state their view of §§ 13-24 in its full connection. This was done, and entirely in accord with the "line of thought in Article XI of the Formula of Concord" as set forth above. According to the "Verhandlungen" (Report) the following men especially found that they fully agreed on this point, the Revs. H. A. Allwardt, H. Ernst (now Professor in St. Paul, Minn.), C. H. Rohe, H. Diemer, J. G. Kunz, A. Brömer (von Schlichten), T. Körner, Director E. A. W. Krauss, and the author of the present work. Yet there was quite a number favoring to a greater or less degree the cause of the "opponents." But most of them withdrew from their "opposition" either already during the Conference, or after it, some sooner and some later, and yielded to the almost irresistible current tearing everything along with it, which always formed in the Missouri Synod when Dr. Walther espoused anything in a decided manner and defended it with the whole weight of his authority, shining in all the glory of practical infallibility. We do not arrogate to ourselves any judgment concerning the hearts of these more than 400 pastors who finally, either openly or silently, declared themselves in favor of Dr. Walther's position; yet it was our conviction at the time, and is

still in all honesty our conviction, based on many years of personal observation and experience, that for by far the greatest majority, although perhaps altogether unconsciously, the mere authority of Dr. Walther decided the whole matter. If he had defended what the "opponents" upheld as Lutheran doctrine, they would have followed him in the same way, and even more joyfully, as this would have been the very thing they had hitherto believed, and without Dr. Walther's authority the other St. Louis professors, although on the whole manifesting more consistency and clearness than he, would never have been able to substitute the modern Missourian for the old Missourian and old Lutheran doctrine.

Dr. Walther and Rev. Stöckhardt especially set forth the modern Missourian doctrine over against the "opponents," the former in a longer speech, treating the matter in a more general way, of which, however, even the most eminent adherents declared in private conversation that it was a very tame affair; and the latter in a briefer exposition, in which he dwelt on the passage of the Confession under consideration. Dr. Walther made the impression as though he would feel relieved if these §§ 13-24 were not in the Confession at all, and as though he entered upon their discussion only because he felt himself compelled to do so. We quote the following assertions as most noteworthy: "The other side has really no election at all, only the doctrine of justification" ("Verhandlungen, etc.," p. 36). "What we teach is no absolute, but a conditional election. The conditions are God's grace, Christ's merit, and faith; but these are conditions which not we, but God Himself fulfills in us" (p. 38)—a conditional election which even the extremest Calvinist can accept and actually does accept, and this altogether in the modern Missourian sense. "This is election that God brings certain persons to the way of salvation, will keep them on this way, even though breaks in the process occur, and finally saves them with absolute certainty. Therefore, faith must not be brought in here as a cause; for this is the question, whether I can also be certain of my salvation. Of this, faith does not make me certain; for I must here know whether I also will remain in faith, for if I remain not, I will still at last be lost"—a confused statement,seemingly teaching a certainty apart from and aside from faith, and thus having quite a fanatical ring. The 8 points are said to state in what way God brings those to salvation whom He has chosen from the

number of mankind without regard to their foreseen conduct. Rev. Stöckhardt attempted to harmonize the §§ referred to with his views; yet he too showed plainly that in his opinion these §§ rather interfered with and disturbed than explained and elucidated the matter. The idea of election in the sense of the Formula of Concord he derived especially from §§ 5, 8 and 23, and thought that he could demonstrate that "this idea of election is found also in the 8 points" (p. 40). "God has predestinated certain persons unto the adoption of children and unto salvation." This, and no more is, as he says, the idea of election.

In regard to the passages quoted in § 13, Eph. 1, Rom. 8, and Matth. 22, which are "as it were the heading for all that follows," he claimed that in them, "especially in Rom. 8, there is reference only to the elect," and that "therefore in what follows there can be reference only to the calling, the justification, the sanctification of the elect." Evidently Matth. 22 did not quite suit him in this regard (compare above p. 115). After saying: "In Eph. 1 we are shown that it" (election) "has taken place in Christ, in Rom. 8 the way is described by which election reaches its goal," he continues: "The passage also quoted in the Confession, Matth. 22, shows, how the elect are called in the same way as the others who are not saved" (p. 40); just as if this passage, which Chemnitz always puts before the rest, were only attached like a superfluous addition.

In the following session the attempt was made, especially by Dr. Walther, to prove that the view of one of the "opponents" regarding the idea of the Formula of Concord was untenable. Especially the following passage in his more extended statement was attacked: "The institution of the universal way of salvation must precede" (i. e. precede "election in the narrowest sense," the "particular choice of certain individual persons unto the infallible attainment of salvation"). "If God had foreseen that all men would permit themselves to be brought to salvation, then no election would ever have taken place. But this must not be taken as saying that men may see how they may become pious, etc., whereupon God decrees to save them. No, God does not say: This is the universal way of salvation, now men may walk upon it. On the contrary, the second part of election is the judicial application of the stipulations of the universal way of salvation on the basis of God's foresight. But in how far is it necessary for God to decree this? one might say. I answer: This is something like

God's working in nature. God has established all nature with all its ordered forces; and yet no one is to suppose that God now sits, as it were, in His easy chair and lets everything take its course according to the order He has fixed. No; all that takes place in nature, lightning, thunder, etc., is an act of God. And thus it is here. I would refer also to an anology, to the doctrine of a double justification. Here we all teach, in opposition to modern theologians, that there is an objective justification which took place through Christ's resurrection. All mankind is justified objectively through Christ's resurrection. There God declared: Now all men are justified, free from sin, and he who accepts this objective justification by faith shall be justified also subjectively. Here too it could be asked: Why this subjective justification? Yet this also is an especial judicial act of God, whereby He judicially applies the objective justification to the believing individual. I look at particular election in a similar way; it is the judicial application of the stipulations of the universal way of salvation." This brief definition of personal election, together with its comparison to subjective justification, i. e. in so far as both are judicial acts of God, and which, if one were to regard only what they are based upon, might be thought to be unnecessary, was attacked especially and even pronounced to be an unheard-of thing in the Lutheran Church (for instance, p. 52), most of all by Dr. Walther, who with his exact knowledge of the old Lutheran dogmaticians could know, if indeed he was not bound to know, that definition, and therefore also the comparison, stated precisely the view of the dogmaticians, although in its own way (compare above p. 24 sq.). At first no one could or would see the point of comparison, and all acted as if the "opponents" taught a universal election of all men! Then Dr. Walther, in order to weaken the argument in the comparison, even denied that subjective justification, i. e. the justification of the individual when he has appropriated Christ's universal merit by faith, is a judicial act of God, expressing himself as follows: "It is not true that a new act follows when I have appropriated objective justification by faith. The act has taken place. By faith I already possess righteousness. God does not need to adjudge it to me individually afterwards." "Objective justification is nothing but the acquisitio of the justitia or the acquisition of righteousness, and God's gift is also there." ("Verhandlungen, etc.," p. 46; compare above p. 36, where it is shown that this is the genuine Reformed

view). Afterwards indeed, as though he had not said the above at all, or as though he wished to hide where he had exposed himself, he maintained: "Objective justification is just as much a judicial act of God as is subjective justification" (p. 50)—just as though any one, save himself, had denied this, and as though this had not been asserted directly in the words of one of the "opponents" quoted above! One of these blundering zealots, whose mouth was to be stopped by the resolution referred to above, but who still thought it his business to second Dr. Walther also here, otherwise an excellent man, yet in theological matters, as well as many another, the mere echo of Dr. Walther, said: "According to this definition election is nothing but the mere foreknowledge of God"! (P. 50.) Think of it: "The judicial application on the basis of God's foresight," "nothing but the mere foreknowledge of God"! Another confessed: "It is now nearly twenty-five years since I have come to faith through the Gospel, but I have not yet heard the subjective judgment of God." (P. 50.) The good man imagined the genuinely Missourian expression, "subjective justification," to signify the same as a "subjective judgment of God," which one might "hear," and yet he felt himself called upon to help annihilate the "opponents." Worst of all, however, and most unjustifiable was the following, when Dr. Walther was reminded of his former approval of Wandalin's definition (see above p. 82 sqq.), he did not scruple to declare, with bold-faced disregard of the facts as known to all, in answer to the "opponent" who accepted this definition: "Then you belong to us. There is not one word here that God has elected on the basis of foreseen faith. We are not such fools as to say that those are elected of whom God foresaw that they would not believe" (p. 51)—as if good old Wandalinus, in his summary of the doctrine of our old dogmaticians, had wanted to say no more than any Calvinist could accept! Moreover, Dr. Walther declared in this connection: "I am saved for the sake of Christ apprehended by faith. But where is it written that for this reason we are elected"? One of Dr. Walther's chief means for proving the above definition of one of the opponents to be contrary to the Confession was this, that he constantly spoke as though this definition made the choice of persons a judicial act of God only in such a way as to be of no benefit to man before his death, contained no consolation, etc. (p. 53 sqq.), whereas already in this definition and exposition, which could touch only briefly upon

single points, we read: "Here" (in § 23 which treats expressly of the choice made) "therefore, is the declaration that God will really save the elect by means of the universal way of salvation in spite of all foes and of their own weakness" (p. 52; compare above p. 42). To be sure two things were here held fast by the "opponents," namely, that the real and chief consolation of election in the sense of the Formula of Concord is found in its first part, in the eternal institution of the universal way of salvation; and secondly, only that choice of persons which follows logically from the stipulations of this universal way of salvation can be full of consolation for us (p. 61; 64 sq.).

In this connection, we would draw attention also to a fundamental difference between Dr. Walther and his St. Louis lieutenants. If we mistake not, Dr. Walther himself had declared: "Those who are not elected are not elected for the reason that they wilfully resist." This sentence was corrected by one of these lieutenants as though it were wrong. Dr. Walther at first agreed to this; but when the "opponents" opposed the correction offered by pointing to Dr. Walther's own former declaration, that those who are not elected are not elected for the reason that God could not choose them, he briefly and emphatically declared: "That is what I still believe to-day; I do not agree with those who deny this" (p. 61 sq.), and yet he remained the faithful ally of these thorough-going Calvinists and shielded them with his authority. We shall see further on how far he permitted himself to be driven by these consistent Calvinists, after giving them his little finger by leaving the standpoint of our dogmaticians. It looks like a singular fatality that he should have been joined to the ranks of these people, "Young Missouri" as we "opponents" sometimes called them, at the time when his mental faculties were no longer what they once had been. Without them he would never have wanted to go so far, and they without him could never have gone so far, as both finally did go together, namely to the length of openly rejecting the doctrine of predestination and the conception of our Confession which has been in force in our Lutheran Church since the publication of the Confession, for nearly 300 years, and has found expression in our best dogmaticians, Bible commentaries, devotional writings, and catechisms!

To ward off all false interpretations of the term "judicial application" in the definition spoken of above, its author declared at the first opportunity: "As far as the word 'judicial' is con-

cerned, I should have said at once that I take it in the sense in which our old teachers call the voluntas consequens" (the subsequent will) "a voluntas judicialis" (a judicial will). "Our theologians, beginning with Hunnius distinguish a twofold will in God: voluntas antecedens and consequens. Gerhard explains this distinction very clearly. You will perhaps permit me to read it, as I would have to say the same thing (Gerhard, loc. VIII. de electione et reprobatione, c. IV. § LXXIX. Ed. Cotta tom. IV. p. 169; ed. Preuss p. 61): 'This distinction, however, (between voluntas antecedens and consequens) does not divide the will itself, which is one in God and indivisible, but distinguishes its two-fold relation. In the voluntas antecedens (the antecedent will) reference is had to the means of salvation in so far as they are ordained on God's part and are offered to all. In the voluntas consequens (the subsequent will) reference is had to these same means, but in so far as they are either accepted or rejected by men. The antecedent will is so called because it precedes the consideration of man's obedience or disobedience, it is simply the gracious will of God extending equally over all. The subsequent will has this name because it follows the consideration of human obedience or disobedience; it shows definitely how this will regards those men who follow the order of means, and those who neglect this order.' Thus when I say 'judicial application', I could have said just as well: 'which is based on the voluntas consequens.'" ("Verhandlungen etc." p. 62 sq.) It was so much the more unjustifiable when Dr. Walther dared to say even after this: "Why, if Gerhard or Quenstedt and others had been offered the definition of election offered us, they would have lifted up their hands in horror" (p. 94) —the exclamation of a true demagogue, which the great majority of the assembly, trusting the learning and the honesty of their leader for so many years, accepted without further thought as really true, whereas this leader must have known that all our dogmaticians who have the intuitu, thus also Gerhard and Quenstedt, thereby of necessity and outspokenly made the choice of persons proceed from the voluntas consequens or judicialis (the subsequent or judicial will), in other words, make it consist in a judicial act (compare above p. 30 sqq.; 57 sqq.; 62; 94; 102 sq.).

We add the following utterances of Dr. Walther and his friends as they are characteristic. "If faith is the rule" (to which God had regard in the choice of persons), "then God was led by this rule, and that makes it a 'cause'. You may deny that you

have three causes of election: God's grace, Christ's merit, and faith; but you are only afraid to put it in these words." Thus did Dr. Walther decree (p. 67). When this illogical as well as uncharitable utterance was answered by referring to justification, where God certainly has regard to faith, and where none of us for this reason thinks of calling faith a cause of justification, or thinks of co-ordinating it in any way with God's grace and Christ's merit, he never entered upon this striking refutation of his dictum, that a rule must necessarily be a cause in the proper sense of the word, but began to speak of something else—a trick of his, which the careful and discriminating reader of the "Verhandlungen" will notice in more than one place. He said: "The fact that in justification grace and faith stand side by side, and not so in election, is due to this that we do not apprehend election by faith, as we do apprehend Christ's righteousness by faith. The righteousness of Christ belongs to the whole world, therefore we can and shall embrace it by faith. But election does not concern the whole world, but only the children of God" (p. 67). And this is the man who claims to abide by the Confession which declares: "Therefore the entire Holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, direct all men" (in other words "the whole world") "to Christ, as to the Book of Life, in which they should seek the eternal election of the Father." (Jacobs' Transl. p. 661, § 66; compare above, p. 44). If God Himself tells all men to seek eternal election in Christ, then it must be present for all in Christ, so that election depends only on our believing in Christ. At another time Dr. Walther declared the statement of one of the "opponents": "God could not determine to elect me without seeing Christ in me", to be "a terrible doctrine", thus openly opposing all our theologians who teach the intuitu fidei, and not only the "opponents" (p. 71; compare above p. 24 sq.). — Another example of how Dr. Walther did not at all meet an uncomfortable objection, but would simply speak of something else, is found in the following. One of the "opponents" had said among other things the following: "Upon this universal way of salvation I must, according to my conviction, base the choice of persons, if this choice is to be full of consolation. The second part of the choice must really be the application of the way of salvation to the individual. Then alone can we console ourselves when the choice of persons is nothing but the application of the way of salvation mediated by the foresight of God. In the position of our opponents election is not really brought into con-

nection with the universal way of salvation, but stands beside it as something peculiar, separated from it by a great gulf. They have two orders of God: one, the universal way of salvation, and one, a particular election. The outcome finally is decided by the latter. According to this doctrine God has had no regard to the order of salvation so as to make it the norm of election. The actual attainment of salvation depends finally and exclusively upon particular election. Nothing depends for our opponents upon universal grace, everything upon election. If I am upon the way of salvation and am not elected, I cannot be saved, even if, as the synodical Report" (see above, p. 93) "says, I hear God's Word ever so diligently, pray, etc. And yet I am to know whether I am elected or not, from the universal way of salvation, which is separated from election by a great gulf. But how can I comfort myself with the universal way of salvation as to my election? how comfort myself with the universal way of salvation upon which at last nothing depends? How shall one who is troubled in conscience console himself when this consolation is not sufficient for those who are thus troubled? We must still go back to the universal way and will of salvation. Just this is my chief reason for opposing your doctrine. It destroys the foundation of the consolation which flows from the universal way of salvation." Every man in any way able to judge will admit that this objection weighs heavily and cannot be ignored or simply set aside. But what did Dr. Walther answer? "This contraposition of election and the universal way of salvation is nothing but an invention of the professor. We do not make it at all. On the contrary, we add the order of salvation and say: He who has not come to faith or has fallen away cannot count himself among the elect. On the other hand, he who has come to faith, is being sanctified, is patient in affliction, prays diligently, uses the means of grace faithfully, he alone can believe that he is chosen. Therefore it is our doctrine of election which says: God wants to bring you to salvation, if you are to be saved, only upon the way of salvation He has ordained. What then is this talk about our tearing asunder! On the contrary, our opponents tear asunder. They speak only of a universal way of salvation, and then away on behind comes election, like a limping, lost messenger. This is no election at all. No, we put the two together; you tear them asunder." (P. 84.) Can any one suppose that a sensible man could imagine he had weakened or refuted the objection offered by this reply, which

any Calvinist might give? The point at issue is this, that according to modern Missourian as well as Calvinistic doctrine the universal way of salvation was not the norm and rule of God's choice, and that therefore no one could conclude as to his election from the universal way of salvation and console himself therewith; and Dr. Walther declares this to be "nothing but an invention", a false accusation, because, according to modern Missourian as well as Calvinistic doctrine, the realization of election in time, the bringing to salvation of those who are chosen according to a secret norm and rule, takes place in no other way than that of the universal order of salvation! And at the same time he talks as though the "opponents" denied that the elect are brought to salvation upon the universal way of salvation, whereas already in the first extended elucidation of their standpoint they had declared in so many words: "These 8 points then are found twice in the doctrine of predestination according to the Formula of Concord; namely, first, after the first half of § 23 as the institution of the universal way of salvation, which institution forms the first part of election in the sense of the Formula of Concord; and secondly, as the way upon which God actually leads the elect unto salvation." (P. 32 sq.)

The following furnishes an example of the manner in which Dr. Walther treated even the oldest and most distinguished of his synodical brethren. One of the "opponents" had said that he could not harmonize Dr. Walther's present doctrine with the former doctrine of Synod, and referred to the theses of Dr. Sihler and to the statements of Rev. Fürbringer (see above p. 54 sqq.), printed in "Lehre und Wehre" without the slightest editorial comment or correction. To this Dr. Walther answered: "This shows that we" (who?—surely not the Synod, which without a doubt, if at the time it took any position at all on this subject, agreed perfectly with these two) "at that time still tolerated in our midst the second form of doctrine" (Lehrtropus). When some one then, who here as always imagined he had to re-echo Dr. Walther's statement, added: "But now no more," Dr. Walther declared: "By saying that 'at that time we tolerated' I do not wish to say: 'But now no more'; rather I would say this: That was not really the voice of our Synod, but the private voice of Dr. Sihler and Rev. Fürbringer. It was not my voice, who am the editor appointed by the Synod as such, and besides this the teacher of dogmatics. He who says this lies."

What, therefore, did not proceed from Dr. Walther's pen was not the voice of Synod and was only tolerated. But in regard to his own position compare what has been stated above (p. 61 sqq.).

The real mystery in predestination Dr. Walther declared to be this: "Why God does not work equally in all men, i. e. in the same way"; "Why God for instance gave repentance and faith indeed to Peter, but not to Judas, why so few come to faith and millions do not, whereas God would be able to give faith to all" (p. 92 sq.); and therefore he repeatedly rejected even the view that faith is the explanation of the fact that one part of mankind is chosen and another not; for then, he said, faith would have to be "a work of man" (compare above p. 19 sq.) But how does this declaration agree with the one cited above, that God passed by those whom He did not elect, because He could not elect them ("Verhandlungen etc., p. 61 sq.; compare p. 96, where Dr. Walther declares that he does not reject the doctrine "that God desired to elect all men")? If God were able to give faith to all men, namely in the ordered way of salvation necessary and sufficient for all, then undoubtedly He could have elected all. Here we see the old Lutheran and the modern Missourian views unharmonized side by side.—The following may serve as an instance of a total confusion of the two: "If I do not believe now that I am one of the elect, then I do not take God to be true. For God has thus described the elect in His Word. I read that we are to watch, to pray, and God will surely hear such prayer" (also the prayer of temporal believers for perseverence?), "and though one should for once fall from faith, he has not ceased to be one of the elect, if he was such before this; but he was either not elected, or he is still of the elect, and God will see to it that he shall again come to faith" (p. 95 sq.). But who will decide for him that now is a believer to which of these two classes he belongs, whether to those for whom God "sees to it" that they shall again come to faith in spite of their falling away, and this because He has elected them without regard to their conduct unto the infallible attainment of salvation; or to those for whom God does not do this just because He has not elected them? God surely does not decide this for any one in His Word. And how then can it be asserted of any man that he does not accept God as a true God, when he cannot consider himself to be one of those who are unconditionally elected?—On page 98 we find the following from Dr. Walther: "The consolation given me by election consists in this that I cannot lose

faith finaliter" (till the end), "in this that election tells me: Not only did God in general decree that all who are saved shall be brought to this goal by a certain way of grace, but there are also a certain number of men of whom God has ordained, according to His purpose, that they shall and must remain in faith, or, if they for once should fall from faith, that they shall lose it only for a time, and shall finally be saved. On this all depends." (P. 98.) But, supposing that what is here stated in agreement with the Calvinists were really the case, how can any man know whether he belongs to these elect; since, to take it strictly, he can in no way draw the least reliable conclusion as to his perseverence and final salvation, and therefore as to his election, from his present faith? for according to this view not only not all who at one time believe remain in faith, or if they fall away return again to faith, but also election itself is not conditioned upon a perseverence in faith made possible for all men by God, since persevering, and therefore truly saving, faith depends in its last instance upon an election made without regard to conduct and faith.—One of the "opponents" had said: "This consolation" (of personal election) "is only a conditional consolation. The consolation must be of the same nature as is the certainty on which it rests. That the first part of election" (the universal order of salvation) "exists for me, I know with absolute certainty; therefore also the consolation" (flowing out of this order of salvation) "to which I must finally always return, is altogether sure for me, and remains when I am troubled. The Formula of Concord knows nothing of another comfort, not remaining when I am troubled in conscience. And of what use could it be to me?" And what was Dr. Walther's answer? "My reply is: I say that I need the consolation at the very time when I am thus troubled" (the consolation of the Missourian Calvinistic election), "at other times I do not need it. When not thus troubled, he" (who?) "thinks: That is very easy; the flesh is easily conquered, and shall not deceive me; the world shall not outwit me; the devil shall not gain the mastery. But when one is troubled, all this disappears. If I then know: I can count myself among the elect" (a strange trial, in which this can be done!), "then I am at ease and content. Then I can say: May the enemies of my soul rage and rave as much as they will, I fear not; for my salvation is in God's hand" (is this not the case in the universal order of salvation?). "If it were in my own hand" (as, accordingly, this is the case with all the non-elect, according to God's arrange-

ment!), "then I might despair; but Thou God, preserve me: I cannot do anything toward this. This is what gives true consolation." (P. 99.)—Yet, according to Dr. Walther, there is still something peculiar about this Missourian consolation. "I cheerfully admit", he says, "that we must first know the doctrine of the way of salvation before we can understand the doctrine of predestination; for a person can be and remain a true Christian, and yet know nothing at all about predestination. He can be a true Christian and be saved in death, and yet have doubted predestination up to his death. This is not the foundation of justifying faith. Predestination has not been revealed to us for this purpose, but for our consolation. Yet I may lack many consolations and still be in faith and persevere in faith . . . No; a Christian need not absolutely have every consolation flowing from the Scriptures, from the Gospel, and still he may be and remain a Christian; and thus it may be and is the case that millions know nothing about predestination, and yet are the best of Christians; they despair not when troubled" (p. 100 sq.). But how does this agree with what this same Dr. Walther declared in the Report of '77, where he makes predestination in the Missourian sense "the very foundation of the great and inscrutable mystery of our salvation" (see above, p. 72; compare also above, p. 120, Rev. Stöckhardt's declaration, according to which predestination is "the basal cause as well of our salvation as also of all pertaining to our salvation"), and where he says: "It is certainly hard to comprehend how a Christian can be altogether at ease when he knows nothing about election" (see above, p. 75)? Here we would have an exceedingly necessary consolation which is really not necessary; a basal foundation which need not be known for one to be "the best of Christians"! Evidently here again we find side by side and unharmonized old Lutheran and modern Missourian Calvinistic views (compare above p. 32 sq.).

This may suffice to give the reader an insight into the discussions of this memorable Pastoral Conference. It is not strange that it was not a success. Dr. Walther's arguments could not convert to modern Missourianism a single "opponent" who was clearly conscious of his old Lutheran standpoint, and as a matter of course no impression could be made by the arguments of the "opponents" upon any man who from the start was convinced that Dr. Walther must be right. Those who wavered and were undecided naturally went with the great crowd, for whom Dr. Walther was right whether he said yea or nay, or whether he used

old or modern Missourian, Lutheran or Calvinistic language. Some, perhaps, were not altogether at ease in doing this; but the same thing occurred here as at and after the Vatican Council. They were silent from respect or love of peace, if not from less praiseworthy motives, tried to explain and harmonize things at least in a halfway manner, became gradually accustomed to the new view, permitted the "opponents" to be represented in the worst possible light, personally and theologically, and remained with the great Synod and its renowned leader!

Toward the close, during the eleventh session the resolution was passed to publish the adopted minutes of the discussions and proceedings without alteration, and this to the great joy of the "opponents", who, as it appeared, would have done many a one a favor, if they would have opposed this publication and thereby prevented it. Besides this the attempt was made to persuade the "opponents" to declare, first, that they no longer regarded the modern Missourian position as Calvinistic; and, secondly, that they would no longer publicly attack this position. Very naturally, they could not agree to the former demand at all, and the latter at least not unconditionally. Hereupon the great majority of the Conference passed the following resolution: "Resolved, that we regard all of the opponents who publicly attack us, no longer as brethren, but as enemies." Dr. Walther and his adherents, of course, did not bind themselves to be silent from now on until all attempts to secure unity by oral discussion should have proved useless and hopeless. On the contrary, every succeeding number of "Lehre und Wehre" brought an article aiming to prove the new doctrine and to secure its adoption.

One of the ugliest pages in the "Verhandlungen" is 111, where the substance is given of what Dr. Walther said publicly in regard to Prof. Schmidt, who was present as a hearer, but was not given an opportunity to defend himself; and yet, as Rev. Allwardt has shown repeatedly afterwards, Dr. Walther could not prove his accusations, nor did he ever retract his calumniation. Dr. Walther claimed that "this person" who "need not now be named", so as not to "reveal his shame", whom he, however, described sufficiently for all present to know, had "tried to undermine our Synod and to gain a following. Then letters flew as in an intelligence office." "It is mere sham, when he appeals to the Report of '79. On the contrary: this Report was just what pleased him, and he imagined that it was a very creditable matter for him

to do this, although he was not at all named, and had already made hostile advances. This we could prove, if desired, by witnesses from our midst." In regard to the Report of '79 in general Dr. Walther remarked: "How little is found here to be regarded as personalities. Only very gently, as with the tip of the finger, a matter is touched upon here, of which the speaker" (Dr. Walther) "knew that the brother concerned" (Rev. Allwardt) "had said it." No man, except he knew the whole matter beforehand, knew who was meant. To be sure, another person" (Prof. Schmidt) "is more decisively refuted in the Report; but most of the brethren even in the Western District did not know even in this case who was meant." Certainly this was an exceedingly lame defence of such a public attack upon men who were his brethren in the faith and with whom he was treating in private (compare above p. 90; and p. 106 sqq.).

III.

THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

F. AFTER THE PASTORAL CONFERENCE IN THE AUTUMN OF 1880.

The General Pastoral Conference in Chicago adjourned on the 5th of October. "Lehre und Wehre" for this month brought an article by Dr. Walther entitled "'Absolute' Predestination." In this article he tries to demonstrate that the modern Missourian doctrine of predestination differs essentially from the "Calvinistic doctrine of absolute predestination." He exclaims for instance: "How can election be absolute and thus unconditional, when it is conditioned by Christ's merit and by the faith which God has determined to give to the elect?! Indeed, it is said in reply, in this very thing lies the doctrine of absolute election that God has chosen the elect without regard to their foreseen faith, and has resolved to give them this faith. How? Is election not absolute and not unconditional only then when not God but man himself fulfills the condition?" We answer: To call an election of men, made possible by Christ's merit as it exists for all men, an election, in which God was not governed by the foreseen faith of the persons concerned, an election, in which He simply decreed: Only to these persons, all others excluded, will I give persevering and truly saving faith—to call this an election conditioned on Christ's merit and on faith, is nonsense and deception, an unjustifiable juggling with the word 'conditional,' which was still held fast at that time, since no open rupture with the old dogmaticians had as yet been risked. What was formerly understood in Missouri, in harmony with the old Lutheran doctrine, by a "conditional" election is seen for instance in Rev. Fürbringer's article (above p. 56 sqq.).

Then after attempting further to prove that the Formula of Concord speaks of election in the same sense as the dogmaticians, namely not of election in the wider, but in the narrower sense (compare above p. 39 sqq.), thus making faith depend upon

the latter as its cause and source, Dr. Walther proceeds to gloss over a few of the most offensive utterances of modern Missouri, some of which have already been referred to above. To begin with he takes up the sentence: "In God there are no conditions" (cf. above p. 65). This, it is said, is "merely to reject the doctrine that faith is the cause moving God to election" (p. 300), and, "in the sense in which it has been taken by some, is no element at all" in the modern Missourian doctrinal position; yet "being capable of misconstruction, as though election were 'unconditional,'" it is withdrawn. Evidently, however, the sentence referred to was not only an unfortunate expression for the proposition that faith is not the moving cause in election, but it was meant to state a general truth, according to which it would be incorrect to say that God has chosen in view of faith. So the sentence is not retracted in the sense in which it was used. The second sentence is this: God's Word testifies that grace removes natural resistance, and even overcomes the most wilful opposition" (das mutwilligste Streiten und sich Wehren), "gives and preserves faith" ("Lehre und Wehre," XIX, p. 173). This is claimed merely to mean: "Thousands have already been overcome and have been converted by grace, who for a time really antagonized grace with wilful opposition" (p. 301)—as though this had ever been called into question, for instance by Dr. Fritschel, against whom this dissertation, the 10th thesis of which begins with this sentence, is directed. On the contrary, the sense of the sentence referred to was this, that those who are elected are, by virtue of this election, led infallibly to give up even the most wilful resistance, while in the case of others who are not elected this resistance "is not removed." "This is a hidden mystery, known only to God, not to be fathomed by human reason, but to be regarded and adored with reverence"—so the thesis declared. It is indeed admitted that these words were "not sufficiently 'explained,' yes, that they might appear offensive even to true Lutherans" (for instance to those of the Wisconsin Synod who found much to object to in the modern Missourian mode of expression, while in the matter itself, at least officially and as a Synod, they agreed with Missouri), "and therefore should be retracted"; yet at the same time, as a sort of justification of these words, reference was made to "men like Jacob Andreæ, Chemnitz, Selnecker, and Kirchner, the authors and official defenders of our Formula of Concord, who taught that if God wished to forsake

His established order and to use His omnipotence, He could convert all men"—something no man has ever denied who believes at all in a God who can do what He wills (Ps. 115, 3.). Yet when Abraham and Paul are here mentioned with Balth. Meisner as "extraordinary conversions," which are said to take place "by an efficacious grace infallibly and always," "as it were through a necessary will and a willing necessity—then we beg permission in the case of Paul to point to two of his own utterances. One of these is found 1 Tim. 1, 13: "Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious; but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief" (Greek ὅτι, because); the second, Acts 26, 19: "Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was" ἐγενόμην, proved, showed myself) "not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." The former proves that Paul's conversion, however wonderful and extraordinary it was in certain respects, nevertheless did not take place without regard to his conduct; and the second, that he might have resisted and frustrated his conversion. And neither in the case of Abraham nor of Paul can any trace of the "most wilful resistance" be shown.

In the February number of the following year, 1881, "Lehre und Wehre" brings an article by Dr. Walther with the heading: "Sententiam teneat, linguam corrigat" (Let him retain his opinion and correct his words). Following this counsel of St. Augustine, and yielding to the solicitation of his "friends," he here continues to correct "certain single sentences" in the Missourian publications, "which indeed have a suspicious sound." In the first place a sentence is quoted from the Report of the Northern District of the year 1868, which reads as follows, p. 23: "In regard to Luther's expression in his preface to the Epistle to the Romans, saying that it depends originally upon God's eternal providence who shall and who shall not believe, it was remarked that if it depended upon providence who shall believe, it certainly likewise depended upon it who shall not believe. Yet this does not say that God would not save such persons." This utterance of Luther Dr. Walther had quoted also in number 6 of the "Lutheraner" in 1880 as a striking proof for the genuine Lutheran character of the modern Missourian doctrine, namely in support of the assertion that in the choice of those who are to be infallibly saved God did not regard foreseen faith, but that saving faith has its source in God's choice made without any regard to man's faith or conduct. Yet now he says he must admit that he "him-

self was not fully clear and certain," nor is as yet, as to what Luther wanted to say with these words; and that therefore he should "either have interpreted Luther's words according to the analogy of faith, or have refrained from quoting them altogether," "since, without explanation, they could, from our lips, appear suspicious to our opponents." At first then he wanted to frighten the "opponents" by holding up to them Luther's mighty authority, and now he must confess that neither then did he know, nor even yet does he know, what Luther wanted to say with these words! It is certain, if one does not want to admit that Luther, in writing the words referred to, believed and taught an absolute predestination, like that of Augustine and Calvin, he must either assert that Luther wrote what cannot be understood, or must admit that in these words he speaks of predestination in the wider sense, and especially of its first chief part, namely of the eternal institution of the universal way of salvation. For upon this "it depends originally who shall believe and who shall not believe, who can be freed from sin and who cannot be freed." He alone shall come to faith and persevere in faith unto eternal life, and can be freed from sin, who permits himself to be led upon the universal way of salvation; he who will not do this neither can nor shall receive life everlasting (compare our "Prüfung, etc.," p. 22 sqq.). But rather than admit that Luther, and following him Chemnitz and the Confession, has spoken of predestination in the wider sense, thus giving up a false view of the Confession, Dr. Walther here confesses that he does not understand this famous passage from Luther, although he had used it against his "opponents" as one of his weightiest cudgels!

Furthermore, Dr. Walther admits that the following sentence from the Report of '77 cannot be retained (p. 59): "The Word of God in truth always retains its power wherever it is preached, and it has the power also of giving life, of saving; yet man is in such a depraved state that God is always obliged to add special assistance" (dasz der liebe Gott auch immer noch nachdrücken muss). Here Dr. Walther admits "that the little word 'always' says too much, and more than we ourselves wished to say; for we too believe that this 'giving special assistance' by no means occurs always, but only often, only at times." The fact that he did not wish to say more than this, he claims, is shown by his former writings. But unfortunately his writings do not agree with themselves in the doctrine of predestination and what pertains thereto, so that

this evidence is not satisfactory. Then too he claims that the Synodical Report does not say "that this assistance is given only in the case of the elect, and only because they are the elect." "We know well that many are in hell who have often experienced this assistance of God, but have not judged themselves worthy of everlasting life, and have always resisted the Holy Ghost obstinately (Acts. 13, 45, 46; 7, 51)." According to this not only the little word "always," but the whole sentence: "Man is in such a depraved state that God is always obliged to give special assistance," should be retracted. Without "the little word 'always'" the sentence does not fit the context, except it is to mean the same thing without this word as it means with it. And hardly anyone will read the sentence in its connection without referring the "assistance" to the greater grace which is given to the elect in preference to the rest, and must be given to every one who is to be saved. According to this corection there still seems to be, entirely contrary to modern Missourian doctrine otherwise, an important difference among those who are to be converted, as some remain in their "obstinate resistance" in spite of the "assistance," and others refrain from it. Or is there a second "assistance" in the case of these last named, these who are converted? Dr. Walther may attempt to correct as much as he pleases, the sentence just as it stands in the Report is a correct expression of what lies necessarily in the modern Missourian doctrine; and if he was not confused, or did not act dishonestly, he could not retract it.

Finally, Dr. Walther refers also to his remarks on a certain passage from Seb. Schmidt in the Report of '77, page 38 (see above p. 94 sqq.). These remarks he had prefaced with the words: "Further, Seb. Schmidt says that God gives a richer grace to the elect than to the non-elect"; and yet he dares to say in his corrections: "Moreover we too do not assert that the gratia amplior" (the richer grace) "is imparted only to the elect. On the contrary, we are convinced by the Scriptures that many who are lost have received this richer grace, while many of the elect who are saved have not become partakers of it. Thus, for instance, the lost inhabitants of Chorazin and Bethsaida were accounted worthy of richer grace than the inhabitants of Nineveh who were brought to repentance and grace by Jonah's preaching." As though he had spoken in the passage referred to about any kind of richer grace whatsoever, and not about that especial "grace unto

perseverance" as such! And of what use is all other richer grace to a man, when that which is claimed to be necessary for perseverance in faith is denied? Finally, however, it is said also of this sentence that "unfortunately what was said was not sufficiently complete and clear," although this sentence also does nothing but state precisely what lies necessarily in the modern Missourian doctrine.

What then has Dr. Walther retracted? Really and at bottom nothing. In the first place, he does not even admit that these sentences, in the connection in which they occur, really say what the "opponents" have found in them, but tries all sorts of ways to gloss them over. And still less does he admit that these sentences say only what lies necessarily in the modern Missourian system, and that this system is therefore to be changed accordingly. If either the necessary clearness or the necessary honesty had not been wanting, he would have been compelled to admit that he must either hold fast to these sentences as they read, or that he must give up and retract his entire new system as un-Lutheran and thoroughly Calvinistic. For it is not that these sentences say something that is foreign to this system, and has nothing to do with it; they express precisely what is the very heart and soul of this system. They are not thoughtless, inconsiderate expressions which for this reason should be retracted, except perhaps in so far as modern Missouri has thoughtlessly and inconsiderately revealed in and through them what it really means. The very consequences which, according to our conviction, lie in modern Missourianism and characterize it as essentially Calvinistic find their adequate expression in these sentences. How would Dr. Walther, who everywhere, and also where these sentences are found, endeavors anxiously to guard himself against Calvinism, have come to utter these sentences, if they did not belong to the consequences of his system; if they were not necessarily implied in and with it? The tree is known by its fruits; the man and his real position very frequently by his unguarded utterances.

At the close of the article spoken of Dr. Walther declares the following to be 'the real status controversiæ, or point at issue, in the present doctrinal controversy": "Does the faith foreseen of God flow from election, or does election flow from foreseen faith? Does election rest alone upon God's mercy and Christ's merit, or also upon man's conduct foreseen of God? Can and

shall a believing Christian become and be certain of his election, and therefore of his salvation, or can and shall he not become nor be certain thereof"? Our readers know from the foregoing how modern Missouri answers these questions, namely that it affirms the first half of each of these three double questions. But this precisely is its fundamental error that it makes faith proceed from election in its sense, i. e. from the choice of persons made without any regard to man's conduct toward the means of grace and toward the Holy Spirit working through them. From this by force of necessity follow all the above sentences which Dr. Walther had to retract at the solicitation of his "friends," so as to hide somewhat the Calvinistic character of his doctrine, at least for the thoughtless and credulous. And from this follow also the assertions that election, i. e. the choice of persons, is made "to depend" not "upon God's mercy and Christ's merit alone," when it is regarded as having been made not without all regard to man's conduct, that a Christian can and should be "certain," i. e. infallibly, without any condition," of his election and therefore of his salvation" (compare above p. 99 sqq.).

Beside these seeming corrections in "Lehre und Wehre" naturally also other articles are found aiming to prove and defend the new doctrine. Thus the December number of 1880 contains such an article from the pen of Dr. Walther entitled: "Is the doctrine that election did not take place intuitu fidei in conflict with the doctrine of justification by faith alone?" Naturally the question is answered in the negative; for if it were to be answered affirmatively, "certainly this doctrine would be the most hideous heresy conceivable." Yet it cannot be denied that the modern Missourian as well as the Calvinistic doctrine dislodge justification and faith from their central position, and consider both to be merely a means for bringing about the salvation decided upon already before them and without essentially regarding them. Only in the same way does the modern Missourian doctrine not conflict with the doctrine of justification by faith alone, in which also the Calvinistic doctrine does not conflict with it. Both do not need justification as an especial act in time, as we have already seen (above p. 35 sq.; p. 128 sq.) and shall see still further on. But that this is not the Lutheran standpoint need not be demonstrated for our readers. The following statement is especially noteworthy in this article (p. 364 sq.): "Accordingly faith cannot bear the same relation to election as it

bears to justification. Election is not, like Christ's righteousness, something obtained and existing for all men, something therefore for all men to embrace by faith, appropriate, and become partakers of. Election is, on the contrary, a decree which, according to the Scriptures, as compared with the reprobate, extends only to a few; for 'many are called,' the Lord tells us, 'but few are chosen.'" It appears to us that a blind man can see that these sentences do not agree with the Confession which says for instance: "Therefore the entire Holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, direct all men to Christ, as to the Book of Life, in which they should seek the eternal election of the Father" (Jacobs' T., p. 661). For according to this statement of the Confession "the eternal election of the Father" does "exist" for "all men" in Christ, because it has been "obtained" by Him "for all," and he who seeks it in the right way, permits himself to be brought to faith and to be kept therein, he shall find it, and he belongs to the elect. That many are called and few chosen is due simply to the fact that most of those who are called do not seek election in this way, and is not at all due to the fact that election does not "exist" for them from the start and has not been "obtained" for them. Whether I am one of the elect depends on whether I am in Christ through faith and abide in Him. It would be blasphemy to assert that God directs all men to Christ to "seek" election in Him, if election did not exist there for all, and if not all, in case they should seek it in the right way, could and would be able to find it in Him. For then God would only make sport of poor sinful men, telling them all to seek for something which from the start exists only for the smallest number of them. There is no question at all that election, according to our Confession, depends upon Christ and faith in the same sense as justification depends upon them; both have their foundation in Christ's merit as apprehended by faith.

In the following volumes of "Lehre und Wehre" several articles by Rev. (now Prof.) Stöckhardt are of special interest in this connection, because he honestly admits what Dr. Walther, in order not to admit that now he taught a different doctrine, had obstinately denied. In the August number of 1881, p. 364 sqq., we find an article by this writer, entitled: "The mystery in Election." Here we read for instance on page 367, etc.: "The discretio personarum, the fact that God, in time and in eternity, in conversion as well as in election, seems to make a difference among

sinners who are all in the same condemnation and who all resist in the same way, this is the real 'mystery in election'. Why God deals in one way with some and in a different way with others, this we are not to fathom. The rule according to which God has chosen and separated in eternity is unknown to us." Accordingly the sentence: Those who are not elected are not elected for the reason that they wilfully resist," is branded as incorrect, while Dr. Walther just ten months earlier had maintained it at the Chicago Conference as altogether correct (compare above p. 130). Rev. Stöckhardt declares (p. 368) that we know indeed from God's Word "why a number of men are cast aside by God," but not "why God did not elect the others"! And here it appears how correctly one of the "opponents" had declared at Chicago: "On page 658, §§ 52, etc." (Formula of Concord, Jacobs' T.) "it is said that there are indeed mysteries in the doctrine of predestination. And now I ask: If the rule according to which God has chosen were hidden from us, would not this have to be the first mystery here mentioned? I am convinced that every one of our opponents would name as the chief mystery in predestination this, that we do not know according to what rule God has proceeded. For this would be the mystery of mysteries in predestination." (P. 83, "Verhandlungen, etc.") And what did Dr. Walther answer to this? "If you say: 'The prævisio must evidently be included according to the Formula of Concord', I say: To be sure, as far as the reprobate are concerned. But when you say: 'God has taken the rule or norm in election from the order of salvation', how do you know that? . . . No; the norm—the Formula of Concord tells us clearly and distinctly—is God's mercy and Christ's most holy merit. This clear statement of the Confession we will not relinquish" (P. 85). It was not long, as shown by Rev. Stöckhardt's article, till this altogether untenable, because utterly illogical, position was abandoned. This was maintained merely during the uncertain stage of transition. When it was seen that the Synod would submit to almost anything, the new doctrine came boldly forth.—Rev. Stöckhardt indeed here adds the remark (p. 368):"We emphasize this that the real 'mystery' is not the primary thing in the doctrine of predestination. We do not give this mystery the precedence of everything, and do not draw all sorts of conclusions from it." The last part of this statement is indeed true, but not the first; and the reason why modern Missourians do not draw the conclusions which lie inevitably

in this "mystery" is absolute inconsistency, or even fear. The "election," in the modern Missourian sense of the word, as the mysterious act of God, is certainly "the primary thing" in modern Missourianism, that upon which everything depends, every man's eternal weal or woe. If I am not chosen in this mysterious way, then I simply cannot be saved, in spite of all talk about universal and sufficient grace. And if the fault that the greater part is not chosen, that for them therefore there does not exist the one thing without which all other grace is vain and simply makes their responsibility, their sin and damnation the greater—if the fault for this does not lie in the non-elect themselves, not in their wilful and obstinate resistance, if it depends only on their natural resistance as common to all sinful men, only upon that resistance which no man can refrain from unless he receive this special particular grace of election: then in reality we have before us the Calvinistic arbitrary separation, even though Calvinistic expressions and terms be ever so carefully rejected. For what difference does it make, as far as the inevitable lot of the non-elect is concerned, to assert ever so vigorously and repeatedly that the reason why God did not elect them was not that He wished to glorify His righteousness in them (p. 368, 369)? He did still not do in them what, according to Missourian and Calvinistic doctrine, He would have had to do in them, if all other grace were indeed to help them unto salvation and not rather unto greater damnation, and what He could have done in them just as well as in the elect. According to the modern Missourian doctrine the elect are in the same plight as according to the old Calvinistic doctrine.

In "Lehre und Wehre", April, 1882, p. 157 sqq., we meet an article by Rev. Stöckhardt, entitled: "Si duo faciunt idem, non est idem" (If two do the same thing, it is not the same). In this article he tries to prove that we opponents of modern Missouri do not agree with the old dogmaticians, even though we use the same terms in the doctrine of predestination as they do. And here we find, to begin with, the following remarkable sentence (p. 158) "It is beyond all doubt that the dogmaticians of the 17th century in some way, although they define it very differently, make election depend upon faith. When they set up the intuitu fidei as a sort of shibboleth; when they understand the statement that God has chosen those whose faith He has foreseen, in the same way; when they bring out the so-called Syllogismus præ-

destinatorius, according to which election follows logically from the universal will of grace and from the foreknowledge of faith: then they thereby declare a dependence of election upon faith. They try to explain somewhat this wonderful mystery of the discretio personarum, and to make it plausible to reason. And herein they have erred and have deviated from the Scriptures and the Symbol. Herein we do not agree with them." Here for once is refreshing honesty and directness compared with the former deceptive assertions of Dr. Walther, saying that the dogmaticians of the 17th century were on the side of modern Missouri in the doctrine itself (compare above p. 113 sq.; 128; 131; 65; 67 sq.). But in spite of this Rev. Stöckhardt thinks that we opponents of modern Missouri do not agree with the dogmaticians; and this, in the first place, because "they took their position not in opposition to the pure doctrine of the Scriptures and the Symbols, but in opposition to Calvinism and tried with all energy to keep out of Lutheran doctrine the decretum absolutum Calvinisticum"; secondly, because "the best of these dogmaticians accept and defend propositions which contradict the theory that election is based on omniscience"—whereas we "opponents", as modern Missouri asserts, do not do all this. But an assertion is in itself no proof. We "opponents" in taking our position have in view the same opposition as the dogmaticians. And what Gerhard for instance, whom Rev. Stöckhardt names as a representative of the "best dogmaticians", teaches concerning predestination, we "opponents" are ready to subscribe to throughout, that is in the sense of Gerhard, not in the sense of modern Missouri. For modern Missouri tells us that there is a contradiction between the various statements of Gerhard. In certain of them, they say, he unconsciously takes the standpoint of modern Missouri, and even refutes what he says in others, especially in regard to the intuitu fidei, as "his sound Lutheran consciousness broke through the error of his reason." Yet Rev. Stöckhardt does not dare to assert definitely, as was Dr. Walther's habit, that if Gerhard were now living, he would now be on the side of modern Missouri. He merely says: "We feel assured, although we have no positive proof, that, for instance, Gerhard, and others like him, if the truth of the Scriptures had been made very clear to him in this article, would simply have thrown aside his own additions without much hesitation" (p. 159). In regard to this we would remark: In the first place, it sounds strange to say that "the truth of the Script-

ures" was not "very clear" to a man like Gerhard "in this article", since he had Luther, Chemnitz, and the Formula of Concord constantly before him; and modern Missourians claim that these three give clear and distinct expression to the true Biblical modern Missourian doctrine. Secondly, it is hardly credible that our old dogmaticians, these men of deep penetration, whose mental work even rationalists like Karl Hase regard with respect, should have been so foolish as to insist unyieldingly upon a doctrine, to understand which, as modern Missouri claims, is of no benefit for salvation and consolation, the doctrine of predestination. There is no question at all, with all their penetration and all the consistency of their thinking they found no contradiction in their own statements, namely that on the one hand salvation and all pertaining and leading to it is simply a gift of grace, and that on the other hand the choice of those who are to be saved infallibly not only did, but also of a necessity, took place in view of faith, if the horribile decretum of the Calvinists was to be avoided. Simply compare the statements above, p. 24 sqq. They harmonize the two sets of statements, which according to modern Missouri are contradictory, in precisely the same way as old Missouri did and as we still do (compare above p. 55 sqq., 61 sq.). If modern Missourians were altogether honest they would have to put the old dogmaticians and us into one class. But they mete with a double measure, and thus hide from many who lack penetration the undeniable fact, that not we alone, but the entire Lutheran Church since the Formula of Concord is their "opponent".

October 13, 1880, a week after the close of the General Pastoral Conference in Chicago, the meeting of the Western District for this year began; this was the District whose Reports for the year 1877 and 1879 had given rise to the doctrinal controversy. "Since sentences in our last two Reports, especially in that of last year, have been met with opposition in the Synodical Conference, the District found itself necessitated to set aside the theme still before it this year, and to treat once more of the doctrine of predestination with especial reference to the objections that have been raised." So reads the Report in regard to the "Doctrinal Discussion," the purpose of which was, as stated, to defend the modern Missourian doctrine against "the objections that have been raised." The theses were six in number, of which, however, only four were discussed. The first and the second,

which are the most important, both as regards their contents and their treatment, read as follows: "Thesis I. The doctrine that election is a cause of the salvation of the elect and of all pertaining thereto (a), as also that alone God's mercy and Christ's most holy merit, and nothing that God has foreseen in man, is the cause of election (b), is not Calvinistic (c), but the pure Lutheran doctrine which our Evangelical Lutheran Church acknowledged publicly as her own 300 years ago, and laid down for all time, on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, in the Formula of Concord; hence those rejecting this doctrine cannot be regarded as Lutherans true to the Confessions in this point. a. Formula of Concord, p. 525, § 5; 651, § 8.—b. F. C. 528, § 20; 665, § 87. 88; 657, § 43. —c. F. C. 528, § 21. Thesis II. Nor is this the doctrine of an election in the wider sense, but in its strict or proper sense. F. C. 651, § 9; 653, § 24. Compare 651, etc., § 11-23." A comparison of the elaboration of these theses with what had been said before and has been set forth above brings out no new argument, and therefore we treat this Report with greater brevity.

As compared with other utterances the admission contained in the introduction to these theses is noteworthy: "We have—this we willingly confess—enkindled the fire" (p. 23). In the elaboration of the theses the "opponents" are constantly treated as teaching an election on account of faith, and this clearly in opposition to the old dogmaticians (p. 34 sqq.). But no proof is brought, and none can be brought, that the "opponents" really hold the non-Lutheran doctrine ascribed to them. And when it is said (p. 35 sq.): "We indeed cannot ignore that in the 17th century the doctrine that God has elected, not indeed on account of faith, yet in view of faith, became established in the Lutheran Church," this surely shows clearly and distinctly that, according to the conviction of the most orthodox and sagacious theologians of our Church, Seb. Schmidt, John Gerhard, John Olearius, Andreas Quenstedt, Abraham Calov, Conrad Dannhauer, from whom quotations are given on this point, and to whom just as many illustrious names might be added, for instance Hunnius, Hutter, Leyser, König, Musæus, one may well teach election in view of faith, and maintain it as a bulwark against the Calvinists, without making faith an efficacious or meritorious cause of election, and without teaching an election on account of faith. And this conviction of our old theologians, who, as far as knowledge of the Bible and of Lutheran doctrine, as well

as sagacity and consistency of thinking is concerned, certainly need not doff their hats to any Missourian, we "opponents" share for conscience' sake and from a full conviction on our own part. Their numerous statements, in which they reject, in spite of their most positive adherence to an election in view of faith, every idea of election on account of faith, or of faith as an efficacious or meritorious cause of election, are therefore not opposed to our position, but are in favor of it, as being the old Lutheran position. That is, the position which the Lutheran Church assumed at once, and assumed fully conscious of its agreement with the Confession, when it became necessary to face the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination; and this is the position which has been recognized alike by friend and foe as that of the Lutheran Church up to the time of the "reformatory" attempts of modern Missouri, i. e. for about 300 years.

On page 40 we read: "The relation of faith to election differs from that of faith to justification. God did not elect all men to salvation and then tell them: Now you may take out salvation for yourselves by faith. Election is not universal as is justification, but individual or, as the Latinists say, "particular"; for the Savior says: 'Many are called, but few are chosen.' Therefore man is not to take out election for himself by faith, so as to become one of the elect; for election has taken place already in eternity. He who is elected, is elected already before the foundations of the world were laid, and faith is now to embrace, not election, but Christ's merit, so as to obtain the salvation which is already adjudged to it by election." This at first appears to be correct, but after closer examination it turns out to be nothing but a jumble of un-Lutheran and illogical assertions. We call these assertions un-Lutheran, because they contradict flatly not only what our best dogmaticians say in regard to the equal position of faith in election and in justification (compare the strong utterances of L. Hutter above p. 27 sq.), but also what the Confession declares, "The entire Holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, direct all men to Christ, as to the Book of Life, in which they should seek the eternal election of the Father" (Jacobs' Tr. p. 661; compare above p. 146 sq.), according to which it is entirely right to say to all men: "Now you may take out election for yourselves by faith." For election as the eternal foreordination unto the infallible attainment of salvation is, according to the gracious will of God, as well also as according to the merit of

Christ, universal from the very start, just as much as is the eternal institution of the universal way of salvation in general; that is, as far as merely God's love and mercy is concerned, He wanted to ordain, and as far as Christ's merit in itself is concerned, He could ordain all men unto the infallible attainment of salvation, and in the universal order of salvation He has made it possible for all men without exception to come to faith and to persevere therein, and thus to appropriate Christ's merit as the sole condition of actual election unto salvation. Since now God knew by virtue of His omniscience who among men would permit himself to be brought upon the universal way of salvation unto persevering faith in Christ, and since He was governed Himself in election by this foreknowledge: therefore, we say with the Confesion to every man: Seek your election in Christ. In Him it is present, and in Him you can find it. If you believe in Christ as your Savior and persevere in this faith, which you as well as every man can do by virtue of the grace and power of God offered to all in the Word and Sacrament, then, beyond all doubt, you belong to the number of those chosen in all eternity. But this conclusion, so full of consolation for all men, follows only from the foregoing old Lutheran premise—another proof for the complete agreement of the doctrine of our old dogmaticians with that of the Confession, yea, in fact, for its necessary deduction from the doctrine of the Confession. We call the above assertions illogical, because they mix up universal and personal justification and confound the two. When we "opponents" claim with our old teachers that faith has the same position in election as in justification, we of course mean, as in the election of persons, so also in personal justification, and not in the universal justification which has taken place for all men in Christ. And here we assert with our old teachers: Just as, notwithstanding universal justification, no man is or can be personally justified and saved who does not appropriate and hold fast Christ's merit in faith; thus also God, in spite of the fact that election in the sense stated above is from the start universal, neither did nor could foreordain any man personally unto the infallible attainment of salvation, of whom He did not foresee that he would apropriate Christ's merit in persevering faith. The indispensable condition of the election, as well as of the justification, of individual persons is the appropriated merit of Christ; otherwise every man would be personally elected and personally

justified, and would be infallibly saved. But the appropriation of Christ's merit takes place only by faith. It is selfevident that in election, as it took place in eternity before the existence of a single human being, faith is regarded as foreseen, whilst in personal justification, as it takes place in time, it is regarded as present. But this is also the only difference. The actual relation of faith to the salvation and to the justification of individual persons is precisely the same. This is Lutheran doctrine. Confused talk about a universal justification, which, rightly understood, is essentially nothing more than Christ's merit as it exists and suffices, according to God's own judicial judgment, for all men, cannot alter this, however much it may hide it from unthinking people. Faith, which (logically and according to God's foreknowledge) precedes election and justification (as it takes place in time and actually), embraces the very same thing: Christ's merit, present and sufficient, according to God's judicial sentence, for all men, or, which is entirely the same, universal justification, i. e., the merciful declaration, made in Christ's resurrection from the dead, that His merit is really present and sufficient for all men. Faith does not precede election and justification, as based on God's antecedent will (above p. 57; 62), and as thus existing for all men, and in so far universal; but it precedes personal election and justification as based on the subsequent will; and in both instances faith does not, in the first place, embrace what follows it, but what precedes it. The relation is therefore the same in both cases. "The relation of faith to election" does not "differ from that of faith to justification." And just as little as justification, because it presupposes Christ's merit embraced by faith, and therefore takes place "in view of faith," has another "cause" than "God's mercy and Christ's most holy merit"; just so little is another "cause," different from these two, ascribed to election by making election to have taken place in view of faith, and faith to precede it (logically and in God's foreknowledge). Confusion and inconsistency is altogether on the part of modern Missouri, and by no means on the part of our old theologians, as though they had unconsciously mingled heterogeneous elements (compare above p. 149 sq.).

From the 11th to the 21st of May, 1881, the General Synod of Missouri and other States met for the third time as a delegate synod, this time in Ft. Wayne, Ind. "The most important event since the last meeting of the General Synod is, without doubt, the controversy on the doctrine of predestination. Its origin and

cause is known. Unfortunately there will be no time to discuss the doctrine itself. . . . . But one thing (in all fairness) we justly could and should do. Since the doctrine concerned has already been set forth in our publications with all fullness, and since it has been repeatedly and thoroughly discussed in larger and smaller Conferences, and since finally also on our part everything has been removed which might offend an honest Christian, certainly, now that the representatives of all our synodical congregations are for the first time assembled again, the time has come for the Synod also as such to acknowledge publicly the doctrine set forth in our publications as being the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures and of our Symbols, and to express its appreciation of the worthy conduct its leaders have maintained in this controversy in spite of many temptations to the contrary." So reads the introduction to the "President's Report" (p. 17 of the Synodical Minutes.) This is enough to characterize the position of the "leaders" fully; they simply expect the Synod, without any further discussion in detail, to acknowledge as Biblical and symbolical what they have published heretofore! So too we read in the introductory words to "I. The position of Synod as such toward the present controversy in its own midst": "What seems to be the duty of Synod is this, to acknowledge the doctrine hitherto set forth and defended in its publications" (p. 27). And this, although the "Synod as such" had as yet never discussed the doctrine nor considered the objections of the "opponents", not even in its single Districts; to say nothing of the many lay delegates, the fewest of whom, if any at all, were conscious of what really was at stake in the doctrinal controversy. But, of course, the subject had been treated in Pastoral Conferences, and "for further doctrinal discussion the extra meeting of the General Pastoral Conference has again been called" (p. 17); "Lehre und Wehre", the periodical intended for pastors, has been filled for years with all sorts of learned articles, endeavoring to prove that what had been generally considered Lutheran for 300 years, what the lay members also of the Missouri Synod, within as well as outside of its borders, had learned as Lutheran doctrine in the Catechism and in devotional books, was false and contrary to the Bible and to the Confession—this was sufficient for requesting the Synod, the lay delegates,of course, included, simply "to acknowledge what had hitherto been set forth and defended" by the Semi-Calvinists at St. Louis, without authority of

Synod, "in its publications"! What if any other synodical body had proceeded in this way! How these Missouri "leaders" would then have accused them of despising and betraying the most sacred rights of congregations! But for us this mode of procedure is only one more proof of the Romish spirit of infallibility which frequently revealed itself in Missouri during the doctrinal controversy (compare above p. 138). But for the sake of appearance, as though also the lay delegates and the congregations they represented had been sufficiently regarded in this respect, the Synod resolved, at the suggestion of a committee composed of all the synodical Presidents and of the professors of the theological faculties, who had been directed to prepare a report outlining further action, "to assume as its confessional expression in the doctrine of predestination the 13 propositions published in the 'Lutheraner', Vol. 36, numbers 2-9" (p. 33), although these propositions did not at all treat the point in controversy (compare above p. 111 sq.)! These propositions, of which it was believed that Synod might assume that "they are known to all our congregations, and have doubtlessly been read also by every one of the lay delegates", read as follows:

"1. We believe, teach, and confess that God has loved the whole world from eternity, has created all men for salvation and none for damnation, and earnestly desires the salvation of all men; and hence we heartily reject and condemn the contrary Calvinistic doctrine.—2. We believe, teach, and confess that the Son of God has come into the world for all men, has borne and atoned for the sins of all men, has perfectly redeemed all men, none excepted; and hence we heartily reject and condemn the contrary Calvinistic doctrine.—3. We believe, teach, and confess that God earnestly calls all men through the means of grace, i. e. with the intention of bringing them through these means unto repentance and unto faith, and of preserving them therein to the end, and of thus finally saving them, wherefore God offers them through these means of grace the salvation purchased by Christ's atonement, and the power of accepting this salvation by faith; and hence we heartily reject and condemn the contrary Calvinistic doctrine.—4. We believe, teach, and confess that no man is lost because God would not save him, or because God with His grace passed him by, or because He did not offer the grace of perseverance to him also and would not bestow it upon him; but that all men who are lost perish by their own fault, namely on account of their unbe-

lief, and because they have obstinately resisted the Word and grace of God to the end, whose "contempt for the Word is not God's knowledge (vel præscientia vel prædestinatio), but the perverse will of man, who rejects and perverts the means and the instrument of the Holy Ghost, which God offers him through the call, and resists the Holy Ghost, who wishes to be efficacious, and works through the Word, as Christ says (Matth. 23, 37): 'How often would I have gathered thee together, and ye would not'. (Formula of Concord, Jacobs' T. p. 656 etc.) Hence we heartily reject and condemn the contrary Calvinistic doctrine.—5. We believe, teach and confess that the persons concerned in election or predestination are only true believers, who believe to the end, or who come to faith at the end, of their lives; and hence we reject and condemn the error of Huber, that election is not particular, but universal, and concerns all men.—6. We believe, teach, and confess that divine election is immutable, and hence that not one of the elect can become reprobate and be lost, but that every one of the elect is surely saved; and hence we heartily reject and condemn the contrary Huberian error.—7. We believe, teach, and confess that it is folly and dangerous to souls, leading either to fleshly security or to despair, when men attempt to become or to be certain of their election or of their future salvation by searching out the eternal mysterious decree of God; and hence we heartily reject and condemn the contrary doctrine as a piece of pernicious fanaticism.—8. We believe, teach, and confess that a believing Christian should try from the revealed Word of God to become sure of his election; and hence we heartily reject and condemn the contrary papistic error, that a man can become and be certain of his election and salvation only through a new immediate revelation.—9. We believe, teach, and confess: 1) that election does not consist of the mere foreknowledge of God, as to which men will be saved; 2) also that election is not the mere purpose of God to redeem and save mankind, for which reason it might be termed universal, embracing all men generally; 3) that election does not concern temporary believers (Luke 8, 13); 4) that election is not the mere decree of God to save all those who shall believe to the end; and hence we heartily reject and condemn the contrary errors of the rationalists, Huberites, and Arminians.—10. We believe, teach, and confess that the cause which moved God to choose the elect is His grace and the merit of Jesus Christ alone, and not any good thing God has foreseen in the elect, not

even the faith foreseen of God in them, and hence we reject and condemn the contrary doctrines of the Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians, and Synergists as blasphemous, frightful, subversive of the gospel and therefore of the entire Christian religion.—11. We believe, teach, and confess that election is not the mere foresight or foreknowledge of the salvation of the elect, but also a cause of their salvation and of all belonging thereto, and hence we heartily reject and condemn the contrary doctrines of the Arminians, the Socinians, and of all synergists.—12. We believe, teach and confess that God has 'still kept secret and concealed much concerning this mystery, and reserved it alone for His wisdom and knowledge', which no man can or should search out, and hence we reject what some would inquire concerning this that is not revealed, and what they would harmonize with their reason in those things that seem to contradict our reason; whether this is found in Calvinistic, or in Pelagian-synergistic doctrine.—13. We believe, teach, and confess that it is not only neither useless nor even dangerous, but rather necessary and wholesome, to present publicly also to our Christian people the mysterious doctrine of predestination, as far as it is clearly revealed in God's Word, and hence we do not agree with those who think that this doctrine must either be entirely concealed, or must be reserved only for the disputations of the learned." ("Synodalbericht", p. 33-35.)

"Hereupon the question was put to the Synod whether all were ready to vote, and when the answer yes was given on all sides, the following question was submitted: 'Does the Synod acknowledge the doctrine of predestination as set forth in our publications, so far as it is summarized in the present 13 propositions, as the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures and of the Lutheran Confession?' The great majority answered a loud and joyful Yea to this question! A very small minority answered Nay! When now each one of the minority was requested to declare in what sense he had voted Nay, the following pastors made declarations as here stated:

Allwardt: 'I voted in the negative not because I reject these 13 Theses, but because I know that I cannot subscribe some of them in the same sense as this is done by others. Much more has been published in our publications on the doctrine of predestination than these theses. Much of this I hold to be erroneous. The question submitted to Synod, however, does not refer to the

theses alone, but to everything 'so far as it is summarized in the present 13 propositions'. In addition to this, theses 10 and 11 contain passages from the Confession the sense of which is now in dispute among us. So I cannot subscribe these theses in the same sense as Synod; and honesty demands that I state this. For this reason I voted Nay.'

H. Ernst: 'When I voted Nay, I did not wish to say that I reject all the present propositions. I most heartily accept most of them with Synod. My Nay was meant especially for the 10th and 11th propositions. And these too, as far as their language goes, I can and do accept. But, of course, I must confess that the sense which I connect with the language of these propositions differs from that which is connected with this language on the part of others. I too believe and confess that the moving cause in election is not any good thing foreseen of God in man, not even faith, but God's grace and Christ's merit alone; but, of course, the latter not merely in so far as it is obtained by Christ, but also in so far as it is appropriated by man through faith. I too confess with the Formula of Concord that election is a cause 'which procures, works, helps and promotes our salvation and what pertains thereto.' By this election, however, I understand not merely the choice of certain persons and their ordination unto faith and unto salvation, but first of all and above all the preparation of salvation in general, the institution of the universal way of salvation. Mainly on account of the first part of election I say that it is a cause of faith. To declare this my position I vote Nay.'

Rohe: 'I agree with the declaration of Rev. Ernst, and would add: It has here been stated explicitly by Dr. Walther that in these propositions the doctrine of a particular election unto repentance, unto faith, etc., is to be firmly maintained, and that is what I cannot accept; for I do not find this doctrine in the Scriptures and in the Confession." (P. 40-42.)

The Revs. J. H. Dörmann, Bühl, and P. Eirich stated that they agreed with these declarations. And these men had the right, formally as well as materially, of thus declaring themselves. For them simply to have adopted the language of the 13 propositions would not have been an open and honest confession; for these contain expressions and declarations which had been understood and interpreted differently during the controversy, especially propositions 10 and 11. Besides this, by adopting these 13 propositions "the doctrine hitherto set forth and defended in"

the Missouri "publications" was to be "acknowledged" (p. 27; compare p. 17). Moreover, it can be easily demonstrated that all the modern Missourian Calvinistic figments may find lodging in these propositions, simply by taking them in the modern Missourian sense; and self-evidently the "leaders", together with their conscious adherents, did take them in this sense, although, perhaps, not even a majority of the delegates. Thus, for instance, the 1st and 2nd propositions were certainly not meant to exclude what Dr. Walther had still declared in the preceding December number of "Lehre und Wehre", namely that election, without which no man can be saved (Report of '77, p. 24, and elsewhere, see above p. 72), has not been obtained and does not exist for all (above, p. 146), although this election has in no way whatever regarded the conduct of men. Accordingly, the universal and earnest will of God's grace and the universal and all-sufficient merit of Christ, spoken of in these first two propositions, must still be understood in the modern Missourian manner, namely, as not including for the majority of men, from the very start and without their especial fault, that without which all else is insufficient for the actual attainment of salvation, namely election. And in the same way propositions 3 and 4 are not meant to exclude this that without election unto faith no man can obtain persevering faith, and that nevertheless this election does not exist for the great majority of mankind; in other words, the universal grace contained in the means of grace brings no man actually unto salvation, without the addition of that particular grace of election which is bestowed, without any regard to man's conduct, only upon a few.

"In reply to the question, what should be the further conduct of Synod toward those of its members who accused the Synod of false doctrine, the following answer was given: As long as they do not sincerely repent of having caused" (whereby?) "others to call us Calvinists, even though they themselves may not have called us so, there can be no thought of remaining together with them, not even if they should retract the accusation that we teach false doctrine. Such repentance is indispensable. It is simply the duty of the District Synods, i. e. of their Presidents, to take the matter in hand and to deal further with our opponents. It is unnecessary for us to adopt any special rules in regard to this. We already have a rule for such cases, and it has always proved

sufficient. It is this, that whoever contradicts a doctrine we teach in conformity with the Scriptures and the Confession, and declares it to be false, must be taken into discipline. If the person concerned will not heed private admonition, if he continues in his error in spite of it, then further discipline must be resorted to by the president of the District, and he must proceed step by step until the evidently obstinate heretic is excluded from synodical fellowship. Indeed, it is to be expected of all those who consider our doctrine false and Calvinistic, or at least having the germs of Calvinism, that they will not wait for this, but will prefer themselves to sever their connection with a synod found, according to their conviction, in such great error. Should this fail to occur, it is our opinion that we are able to wait quietly until that course is taken with them which God's Word prescribes for all who do not abide in the saving doctrine, and at the same time we would have to reproach them as people who do not seem to be really in earnest about their doctrine, as people who by their own action declare that they have disturbed the Church of God for nought." (P. 42.) This certainly leaves nothing to be desired as far as clearness is concerned, and shows the desire that was felt to be rid of these men and their inconvenient admonition and warning. The same spirit breathes in the following resolutions: "Resolved, that the delegates chosen by the (different) Districts of our Synod for the Synodical Conference herewith receive the following instructions: 1) 'You are to sit in session with no person who has publicly accused us" (whom? Synod had not at all declared itself up to this time) "of Calvinism.' '2) You are to acknowledge no synod as a member of the Synodical Conference, which, has accused us of Calvinism.'" (P. 45 sq.) In the past the Buffalo Synod had been reproached, and this according to our conviction with justice, for refusing to treat with Missouri in regard to doctrinal differences until Missouri had canceled the practical outcome of her position in regard to these differences, had recalled her "schismatic preachers", that is had taken back the very thing, the correctness of which she was still convinced of, and the incorrectness of which was still to be demonstrated to her by doctrinal discussion.

Now the very thing Buffalo had demanded of Missouri is demanded by Missouri herself of the opponents of her new doctrine of predestination in the Synodical Conference, namely, re-

traction of what these opponents had done, that is, said and asserted in consequence of their convictions with regard to the doctrinal difference, retraction before these differences had been properly discussed by the two sides. Furthermore, note the usurpation of power Missouri here arrogates to herself as a matter of course in regard to the Synodical Conference; Missouri decides who is to be a member of the Synodical Conference. It is not the right and duty of the Synodical Conference as such to decide which of the two contending parties is to be acknowledged as an orthodox member of this body; no, Missouri herself, one of these parties, makes the decision beforehand. Missouri in its excitement fails to find it necessary, even for appearance' sake, to act as simply a co-equal member of the Synodical Conference, and hence subordinate to this body, and not its lord and master.

Before taking leave of this Synodical Report we must add that it contains—and this before the vote in regard to the position of the Synod was taken—the following declaration concerning the old dogmaticians: "It is indeed true that we have tolerated" (no more? see above p. 53 sqq.) "in our midst also the mode of expression used by later teachers in the Church" (Hunnius lived 1550-1603, Hutter 1563-1616, Leyser 1552-1610, Nicolai 1556-1608; see above p. 25 sqq.). "Because we knew that their doctrine of predestination was not false, we never declared them to be false teachers on account of their mode of expression. But we have always thought that it were better to drop this mode of expression, as used by later dogmaticians, the so-called second 'Lehrtropus', and now, compelled by painful experiences, we have indeed dropped it as a rule" ("herrschender Weise"--what does this mean? dare it still be used here and there, by way of exception?). "As many nowadays" (who?) "are guilty of a shameful abuse with regard to this mode of expression, we do not wish to appear as people who aid this abuse by retaining the mode of expression. If our opponents had told us that they could not bring themselves to speak differently of predestination than for instance J. Gerhard does, and if they had made the same explanation he makes" (and did they not do this?), "so that we could have seen that only the mode of expression was concerned, and that in the doctrine itself we were all agreed, then most likely there would have been peace between us and our opponents" (p. 37 sq.). Compare with this what "Lehre und Wehre" declared about eleven months later con-

cerning the doctrine of predestination of our dogmaticians (above, p. 149 sq.).

In conclusion we direct attention to two natural products of the modern Missourian doctrine of election. The first of these is the assertion, repeated constantly with fanatical zeal as the very quintessence of Biblical Lutheran orthodoxy, viz., that it is synergism to teach that man's conversion and salvation depends also upon his conduct toward the means of grace and toward the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit. Yea, it is declared to be synergism, to be even "heathenish", and so abominable that "all who wish to be Lutherans should rise as one man against it," when we teach: "That the Holy Spirit alone works conversion and faith in us, and also preserves it; that He does both through the means of grace, yet not in an irresistible manner, so that every man whom He desires to convert and save must necessarily be converted, but in such a manner that man at every stage of His work may so conduct himself as to frustrate the Holy Spirit's works; that, consequently, if man would be saved, he must desist from this conduct, and in so far also must conduct himself differently, although this right conduct is made possible for him not by his own natural powers, but only by the divine operation" (yet not by compulsion, not irresistibly—see "Zeitblätter" 1888, p. 129 sqq.; "Lehre und Wehre" 1891, p. 21 sqq. and elsewhere; compare "Zeitblätter" 1891, p. 130 sqq.). In regard to this modern Missourian, Calvinistic assertion compare the utterances of Leyser and of Nicolai (above, p. 26 sq.) and of old Missouri herself (above, p. 53; 59 sqq.; 62). — The second natural result of the modern Missourian doctrine of election is the renewal of the assertion, made by Dr. Walther at the General Pastoral Conference in Chicago and then retracted at least apparently, namely, that justification precedes faith, and does not depend, and is not conditioned upon it (above, p. 128 sqq.: "Lehre und Wehre" 1888, p. 161 sqq.; compare "Zeitblätter" 1889, p. 129 sqq. 321 sqq.). Accordingly, this is modern Missourian doctrine: "Christ's righteousness has been imputed to all" (through Christ's resurrection). All men are now accounted as just and obedient before God. Justification has been imparted to all, namely, the justification of life, by virtue of which life instead of death, eternal life is adjudged to them." Every single person is now "actually justified, and not merely as far as possibility goes", "no matter whether he believes, or does not believe." "The

most dangerous consequences" are said to result from the teaching hitherto customary in the Lutheran Church: "When a sinner is converted and believes in Jesus Christ, then God forgives him his sin" and justifies him! In regard to this we simply point to the old Missourian Catechism, which teaches in full harmony with the Bible, the Confession, and the dogmaticians, question 306: "Justification is that act of God, by which He, of pure grace and mercy, for the sake of the merits of Christ, forgives the sins of a poor sinner, who truly believes in Christ, and accepts him unto eternal life."

III.

THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

G. COMPARATIVE SUMMARY.

Before closing the discussion of the doctrine of predestination of the Missouri Synod, it appears to be in place to summarize briefly its chief peculiarities, and to compare them with the old Missourian, the genuinely Lutheran, and the Reformed doctrine. This we here undertake. We choose the form of questions and answers.

1. WHAT IS PREDESTINATION?

a) Old Missouri answers: "Predestination is that act of God in which, before the foundation of the world, thus from all eternity, He determined, according to the purpose of His will, to save eternally, for Christ's sake and for the praise of His glorious grace, all those whose persevering faith in Christ He has foreseen. Eph. 1, 4-6; 2 Tim. 1, 9." (Above p. 53; compare p. 64 and 82 sq. and 129.)

b) Modern Missouri: "Election is the unalterable and eternal decree of God, by which, from the entire human race (fallen by its own fault from its original state of innocence into sin and destruction), according to the free purpose of His will, out of pure grace and mercy, He ordained unto salvation a certain number of individual persons, neither better nor worthier than others, lying together with them in the same universal destruction." ("Lehre und Wehre" XIX, p. 140; compare above p. 116.)*

* Note also the change made by the Wisconsin allies of Missouri in the old Dresden Catechism, the so-called "*Kreuzcatechismus*". Here the answer to question 304: "Who are the elect?" reads: "The elect are they *of whom God has foreseen in eternity that they would persevere in their faith in His Son Jesus Christ until their end.* Eph. 1, 3. 4; 2 Thess. 2, 13. 14. This explanation, harmonizing completely with the doctrine of old Missouri and of the old Lutheran dogmaticians, the Wisconsinites have

c) The Calvinists, that is the strictest among them, who hold fast to the resolution of the Synod of Dort, answer precisely as does modern Missouri (above p. 29)! Indeed, the answer of the latter seems to be a translation of the passage concerned from the Confession of Dort!

d) The old Lutheran dogmaticians: "Election or predestination in the wider sense is that eternal decree of God, by which in His infinite mercy He determined to send a Mediator for all men, of whom He foresaw that they would fall into sin, and to offer Him by universal preaching for all to accept; also to impart to all, who would not resist, faith through the Word and Sacraments; to sanctify all believers, and to renew those continuing the use of the means of grace, and to preserve faith in them unto the end of their lives, and finally, to save those who believe to the end, for the glory of His goodness. Predestination or election in the stricter sense is that eternal decree of God, by which God in His infinite mercy determined to give eternal salvation to all those, and only to those, of whom He foresaw that they would believe in Christ till the end, and this for the sake of Christ's merits, which must be aprehended by persevering faith, and is foreseen as such,—for the sake of their salvation and of His glory." (Baier, Compendium Theol. pos.; compare above, p. 45 sq., 48 sqq., 25 sqq.

2. WHAT HAS GOD REGARDED IN ELECTION?

a) Old Missouri answers: Also "the conduct of man," especially his "persevering faith," is the indispensable "condition"; it is false Reformed doctrine that in the eternal counsel of God respecting man "man's conduct was not at all regarded, not even faith." From the purpose of God "to save only those who believe perseveringly" their "election is to be deduced," and "this conjunction of the two is conceivable only as mediated by foresight." "A blind predestination, not enlightened by knowledge, is unknown to the Confession" (above, p. 54; 56). "The subse-

---

altered in their Catechism, "prepared on the basis of the Dresden *Kreuzcatechismus*", to read as follows: "The elect are they who are called by the Gospel, enlightened with the gifts of the Holy Spirit, sanctified in the true faith, and kept with Christ Jesus until thetr end, and thus saved eternally, according to the gracious purpose and pleasure of God in Christ Jesus" (question 215) — an explanation which the strictest Calvinist may adopt without she slightest reservation.

quent will" of God, from which personal election proceeds, "conditions" the antecedent, universal will of God's grace "by that of the creature," although "not at all in any synergistic sense" (above, p. 57).

b) Modern Missouri: "This will of God, however," according to which we are chosen, "is also itself not determined by any other will." God has chosen some merely "because He so willed"; "according to His mere pleasure" He gives us eternal life. (Above, p. 72.) "Therefore, because it is already certain through election that a person is to reach heaven, God foreknows it." As a judge's foreknowledge of the execution of a criminal is "conditioned" by his foreordaining the act, so also God's foreknowledge in election is "dependent" upon His foreordination, and not vice versa (p. 77). "All regard to man's conduct" must be excluded, also all regard to faith (above, p. 119). Also those who are not chosen are not chosen not for the reason that God foresaw their wilful, contumacious resistance (p. 130; 147. Election is conditional only in so far as God has regarded Christ's merit, obtained for all, and faith, in so far as He has determined to give it to the elect." (P. 140 sq.)

c) The Calvinists answer in the same way as modern Missourians, that God has had no regard whatever to man's conduct and faith (above p. 30); they differ from Missouri, and to their own advantage, only in this that in consistency and honesty they do not speak of a conditional election. We read, for instance in Article X of the 2nd Helvetian Confession: "God has foreordained or chosen from eternity, freely and of pure mercy, without any regard whatever to man, the saints whom He desires to save in Christ."

d) The Lutheran Church: "The reason" that many are called, but only "few are chosen" is this, that the non-elect "either do not at all hear God's Word, but wilfully despise it, close their ears and harden their hearts, and in this manner foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in them" (Formula of Concord XI, Epit. 12, Jacobs' Transl. 526); in other words, they do not conduct themselves aright toward the Holy Spirit and the means of grace, and do not permit faith to be wrought in their hearts. For "God has ordained in His counsel that all those who, by true faith, receive Christ He will justify and save" (Jacobs' Transl., p. 656). An essential part belonging to predestination is the decree of God "that the good

work which He has begun in them," the believers, "He would strengthen, increase, and support to the end, if they observe God's Word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness, and faithfully use the gifts received" (p. 653). The Lutheran theologians consider it "Calvinistic, unchristian, and heathenish" to teach that God has not regarded, "cared nought about it, and determined nothing regarding it," "how the children of men would conduct themselves toward the holy order which He Himself established for salvation," whether they would "use" it, or "despise" it. "From this foreseen difference between men reprobation as well as election follows." "Not all, but only some are reprobated, because of the difference of faith and its opposite, unbelief." (Above, p. 26 sqq.)

3. WHAT IS THE RELATION ESPECIALLY OF FAITH TO ELECTION?

a) Old Missouri answers: Faith, "is an intregal part of the order in which God offers the blessing of election to men." As election, i. e. the choice of persons, election, in the narrower sense, is neither the foundation nor the means, nor the condition of salvation (for these are Christ, His Gospel, and the faith given thereby)," so also it is "not the cause of our faith, in so far as faith would be the effect of election; for the Word works faith" (above p. 55). "God has also not elected us that we should believe, but because He foresaw that we would believe" (p. 64). It is "false doctrine of the Calvinists" to say: "Election is not out of the foresight of faith, but is unto faith" (p. 65).

b) Modern Missouri: Even to consider faith only "the middle link," "so that the motive in election would not be faith in itself, but Christ and His merit apprehended by faith," is already "Pelagianism," because faith is then "not the middle link, but a condition," and "a certain causality will still be ascribed to faith" (above, p. 66). "Election" (in the Missourian sense, the choice of persons) "is the cause of all that takes place for the salvation of the elect; it is the cause that any one comes to repentance; it is also the cause when one who has fallen away returns unto repentance" (p. 67). This election is, "as it were," the "very fountion of the great, unsearchable mystery of our salvation" (p. 72). "Faith cannot bear the same relation to election as it bears to justification. Election is not, like Christ's righteousness, something obtained and existing for all men, something therefore for all men

to embrace by faith, appropriate, and become partakers of." (Above, p. 146 sq.; compare p. 153). "God has predestinated us unto faith," not in foresight of faith (p. 119 sqq.).

c) The Calvinists: "Election" (as the choice of particular persons) "did not take place in view of faith, but unto faith. Consequently, election is the source of every blessing belonging to salvation, whence faith, sanctification, etc., proceed" (above, p. 30).

d) The Lutheran Church: To election belongs the following, as the fourth decree, "that all those who, in true repentance, receive Christ by a true faith He would justify and receive into grace, adoption, and inheritance of eternal life" (Jacobs' T., p. 652, etc.). "All men should seek in Christ the eternal election of the Father," and this by faith (661). Hutter says, "it is a horrible blindness or giddiness of mind that will not recognize the same condition and relation of faith in the article of faith" as in the article of justification (above, p. 27). And "herein all pure theologians on our side are united" and "agree with one accord and teach unanimously against the Calvinists," says Musæus (above, p. 112).

4. IN WHAT SENSE DOES THE FORMULA OF CONCORD SPEAK OF ELECTION?

a) Old Missouri evidently was never entirely clear on this point. And this lack of clearness seems to explain to us also Dr. Walther's confusion and contradiction in so many places, and this not only when in the heat of controversy he resorted to very questionable weapons and subterfuges.

b) Modern Missouri asserts, as all know, that the Formula of Concord speaks of election in the narrower sense, that is exclusively of the choice of persons; and it is compelled to do this, if it would give its doctrine even in part the appearance of agreeing with the Confession (above, p. 95 sq.; 115 sqq.).

c) What the Lutheran Church thinks on this point, namely that the Formula of Concord speaks of election in the wider sense, is shown, in the first place, by the clear words of the Confession itself (especially p. 651, § 9; 652, § 13-24; compare above p. 39 sqq.), and secondly by the clear and repeated utterances of our old dogmaticians (above, p. 45 sqq., 48 sqq.).

5. IS MAN'S CONVERSION AND SALVATION IN EVERY SENSE INDEPENDENT OF HIS CONDUCT?

a) Old Missouri answers: No (above, p. 55 sqq.). Dr. Walther, "Postille," p. 91: "He who opposes not merely his natural resistance to the operation of the Holy Spirit, but also an obstinate and obdurate resistance, him God Himself cannot then help; for God will force no one to conversion, a forced conversion is no conversion." "For, although all men are by nature equally sinful, and although God must first remove this resistance, yet on this account no one is lost; for when God comes with His Word He also comes with His Holy Spirit to remove the natural resistance. But he who then not merely, etc." Page 92: "God could not choose many merely for this reason, because He foresaw, that many would obstinately resist His Holy Spirit, reject the means of grace and make them fruitless in their work, would not believe, or would not remain in faith, but would become obdurate and hardened." Synodical Conference: "Now, however, God looks about in the world to see how people will conduct themselves toward this redemption of Christ, etc." (Report of 1872, p. 36; compare "Zeitblätter," 1889, p. 345.)

b) Modern Missouri: Yea (above, p. 79; 93 sqq.; 163 sq.).

c) The Calvinists have essentially the same position on this point as the modern Missourians (above, p. 34: "entirely dependent upon predestination" is man's conversion and salvation, and not in any or the least sense upon his resistance or non-resistance.

d) The Lutheran Church teaches: If man is to be converted and saved, he must "conduct" himself aright toward the means of grace and the Holy Spirit operating through them, and this he is able to do through the grace and strength offered in the means of grace (Jacobs' T., p. 561 sqq.). Otherwise the Holy Spirit cannot convert and save him (p. 526; compare 652, § 17; 653, § 21; 656, etc. § 40-42; above, p. 41; 43; 24 sq.). To assume the contrary is "Calvinistic, unchristian, and heathenish" (above, p. 26). "Reprobation as well as election proceeds" from the foreseen different conduct of men in this regard (p. 26 sq.). "When" man "is in the workshop of the Holy Ghost and offers no wicked resistance to the means of grace," God brings him to conversion. The "decision" of his will in conversion "is not a thing of necessity or of irresistible compulsion, although, presupposing the

divine order" (the following of this order, right conduct toward it), "it is infallible" (p. 83).

6. MAY WE SPEAK OF MAN'S DECISION OR "SELF-DETERMINATION" IN CONVERSION?

a) Old Missouri answers: Yea (above, p. 57-61).

b) Modern Missouri answers: No (above, p. 68). Grace works irresistibly; wherever God wills, His grace forces its way, removes all resistance, even the most wilful: "Experience confirms the fact that He does not remove the resistance of millions of men against His Word, whereas He could remove it from them as easily as from the elect" ("Lehre und Wehre" 1871, p. 172). "It must be an easy thing for God to remove a man's resistance, so that this cannot hinder Him, when He determines to save a man . . . Hence when God turns to a man with His grace, all resistance gives way, as the snow melts before the rays of the vivifying sun in spring time. . . . God also often takes the most wilful resistance from the elect." "Theol. Monatshefte" 1873, p. 117; compare above, p. 141 sq.; 147.)

c) The Calvinists, according to the above, agree very naturally with modern Missouri; nothing but the free will of God, decides conversion (above, p. 32). Grace works irresistibly (p. 34).

d) The Lutheran Church is determined to know nothing of an irresistible grace, as is shown already by the passages quoted under question 5; and therefore she cannot object to speaking of man's decision or "self-determination" after the manner of old Missouri. Compare furthermore the Formula of Concord (Jacobs' T., p. 564), where we read among other things as follows: "And although God does not force man to become godly (for those who always resist the Holy Ghost and persistently oppose the known truth, as Stephen says of the hardened Jews, Acts 7, 51, will not be converted) etc." And what Baier says (Comp. Theol. pos. III., 1, 7), that God, by His saving grace does "not irresistibly determine or decide (irresistibiliter determinet) us to use the Mediator aright, but that He wants to do only what is demanded on His, God's, part to make it impossible for no man to partake of the Mediator"—this is universally the doctrine of our dogmaticians and other thelogians. Dieckhoff, in his noteworthy anti-Missourian work, "Zur Lehre von der Bekehrung und von der Prædestination," (On the Doctrine of Conversion and Pre-

destination) gives the following entirely correct summary of the discussion of this subject by Calovius, a strict Lutheran, (p. 105): "Man does determine himself in conversion, from the indifference of his free-will, to will his own conversion by means of the powers received. This willing itself is wrought by grace. When man in conversion decides for conversion, he does this determined thereto by grace, but not determined thereto 'præcise,' so that he must, so that he could not resist the operation of grace, nor follow the contrary will of the old man." Nothing more than this was intended by Dr. G. Fritschel, whom the Missourians vilified so much, in his use of the term "free self-determination" of man (above, p. 68).

7. WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE LUTHERAN AND THE REFORMED DOCTRINE OF ELECTION?

a) Old Missouri: It is distinctively Reformed, and therefore un-Lutheran, to conceive of predestination as a "decree in which man's conduct was in no way regarded, not even faith" (above, p. 54). "This is the point of difference, dividing the pure doctrine from the Reformed particularistic doctrine, namely, that the power of the divine Word unto conversion and regeneration has not predestination as its presupposition" (p. 55). "The theologians of Dort place the chief predestinating cause of the damnation as well as of the salvation of those born now in a sinful condition, absolutely in God and in His beneplacitum absolutum" (absolute pleasure) "without basing election with the Lutherans upon the foresight of persevering faith, i. e. conditioning the former in God upon the latter" (p. 58). "That God has elected a few according to His mere will and pleasure without regarding faith grounded in the merit of Jesus Christ, is the constant doctrine of all the Reformed, as many of them as bind themselves to their symbolical books and consent to the Synod of Dort; and although a few admit that election did not take place without all regard to the merit of Christ and to faith, yet they do not mean that God from eternity elected those of whom He foresaw that they would believe and accept Christ's merit, but that He elected some few according to His mere absolute will that they might believe in time. Hence faith is not considered among them as a cause or condition of election, but as a necessary effect of election . . . God did not elect us because we believe, but that we

may believe . . . Because faith is God's gift He did not foresee it and direct His election to it." (P. 61 sq.)

b) Modern Missouri: "The very thing that makes the teaching of the Calvinists so horrible" is now by Missouri said to be this that they speak only of the "mystery" of personal election, and not of the way in which God saves the elect, or carries out the election made without regard to man's conduct and faith; still in regard to the (mysterious, unknown) rule of election, and also in regard to the way in which it is carried out they agree in all essentials with modern Missouri (above, p. 95). At another time the difference between Lutherans (Missourians) and Calvinists is said to be: The Lutherans "teach only one predestination, that unto salvation, none unto damnation; they teach universal grace and an earnest will of God to save all men; they teach that all men are redeemed through Christ; they teach that God has chosen to elect only for the sake of Christ, and for the purpose of bringing them to faith and salvation in the same way in which He desires to save all men; they teach that God earnestly and efficaciously calls also those who are not saved, earnestly and efficaciously offers them His Holy Spirit, grace, faith, perseverence, and salvation, and that they are lost only because they despise all this and obstinately resist the Holy Spirit till the end, etc. Where then do you find the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute election? . . How can election be absolute, i. e. unconditional, when it is conditioned by Christ's merit and by the faith God has determined to give the elect?" ("Lehre und Wehre", 1880, p. 295, etc.; compare above, p. 140 sq.) Note that there is no mention made here at all of the difference stated by old Missouri, of the difference which must exist, if the Lutheran doctrine is to differ really and essentially from the Calvinistic, for the certain consolation of all poor sinners. In this "Lutheran" doctrine, which no longer warrants the old Lutheran conclusions of election in view of faith, and of conversion and salvation not without all regard to man's conduct, most men, all who are not elected in the Misourian and Calvinistic sense, are in reality, as far as all that is essential and decisive is concerned, left in the same miserable position as in the genuinely Calvinistic doctrine: without any fault of their own that grace is denied them, without which all other grace saves no man.

c) Our old Lutheran theologians give the difference pre-

cisely as did old Missouri; the latter only appropriated their expressions and thus acknowledged their doctrine.

d) What the impartial M. Schneckenburger states as the essential difference between genuine Lutheran and genuine Calvinistic doctrine in regard to election, we have set forth at length above, p. 30-36. We here merely refer to the following points. For the Lutheran "this eternal election" (i. e. the choice of persons) "is not the principle determining the entire development of the individual and his final goal" (as this is the case with the Reformed); "on the contrary, all the stress which the Reformed view, in order to carry out the idea of grace, places upon the eternal, pretemporal act of election, is placed by the Lutheran view upon the fact of actual universal redemption and of individual justification, upon the efficacious power of the Holy Spirit influencing man's decision. . . . The final issue is made to depend upon the preceding development, in which the individual acts as a true moral agent, and in which grace offers true means of grace whose use or abuse produces a decisive result. This view, however, appears inconsistent to the mind of the Reformed, and at the same time lacking in piety, and he opposes to it his dogma of predestination" (above, p. 31). "For the Lutheran the consilium salutis" (the counsel of salvation) "is in general that in which his interest concerning the eternal decrees of God concentrates; while the Reformed conceives of this concilum salutis only as connected with a predestination of individuals. . . . Yet in teaching a divine predestination on the basis of the Scriptures, the Lutherans make this dependent on faith, that is on the divine prescience of faith, and God's free grace does not consist in this that He gives faith and with this a share in Christ and in eternal life, according to His pleasure" (having regard to nothing in or about man), "but in this that He imparts to the believer, who in himself is a sinner and merits condemnation, for the sake of Christ forgiveness and salvation. Of this grace man becomes certain in justification, and the thought of predestination is for him only an element in his assurance of salvation, wherewith he comforts himself in the battle and misery of the world. . . The Reformed has the following objections to make against the Lutheran dogma referred to: If faith were the condition of a predestination depending not upon itself alone, or upon the divine volition, then salvation, to which predestination admits, would not be a pure gift of grace. . . . Accordingly, the Reformed doctrine establishes

a predestination of God unconditioned by His foreknowledge, rather conditioning this itself, producing its results with absolute, irresistible power in and among men." (P. 33 sq.) For the Reformed "the element of justification, as an objective act of God, carried into effect through the media gratiæ" (the means of grace), "must recede behind the element of eternal election, in which the vocatio, regeneratio, and justificatio are already included as nothing more than stages in the development of the individual under the influence of grace." Justification, on the contrary, "is looked upon by the Lutherans exclusively as a transcendent act, immanent in God, and intransitive, the result of which does nothing but enter the consciousness of the subject concerned, and is received with the same faith which for the individual forms the condition for bringing the divine act to pass" (p. 36). Compare in addition above, p. 72; 119; 128; 163.

8. How must the doctrine of the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century be regarded?

a) Old Missouri answers, aside from its confession of this very doctrine, as contained in the teaching of Old Missouri herself, and this even in its transition to modern Missourianism, as follows: "Our Synod confesses most positively that the theologians of our Church, also in the 17th century, taught the correct doctrine of predestination, and defended it against the Calvinists" (above, p. 67 sq.; compare p. 113).

b) Modern Missouri: "It is beyond all doubt that the dogmaticians of the 17th century in some way, although they define it very differently, make election depend upon faith. . . . And herein they have erred and have deviated from the Scriptures and the Symbol. Herein we do not agree with them." (Above, p. 149 sq.).

c) The judgment of our old dogmaticians themselves is found in their statements regarding election in the wider and in the narrower sense (above, p. 48 sqq.; compare p. 29, where election in view of faith is taught as being indisputably contained in the Formula of Concord). Since the publication of the Formula of Concord, for some 300 years, the Lutheran Church has unanimously held that the doctrine of our Confession and of the following teachers of our Church harmonized perfectly also in the article of predestination. Modern Missourians are the first

"Lutherans" who assert the contrary; it is to be hoped that they will also be the last.

9. HOW IS THE DOCTRINE OF MODERN MISSOURI TO BE REGARDED?

a) Modern Missourians, of course, claim that it alone is genuinely Lutheran; whether this claim is made with a good conscience, we leave to the judgment of the omniscient God.

b) Every impartial man who has followed the above presentation with close attention, whoever he may be, must admit that in all essentials the modern Missourian doctrine is genuinely Calvinistic. It is not merely that single phrases are accidentally the same as those of Calvinism. It is not the play of chance that the modern Missourian definition of predestination is exactly the same as that of Calvinism. The entire modern Missourian view is Calvinistic, as the old Missourian was Lutheran. Calvinistic is, the idea of the position and of the all-decisive importance of personal election in the counsel of salvation; the idea of the relation of faith to election; the idea of the independence of election as far as the foreknowledge and all the conduct of man is concerned; the idea of the irresistible operation of the grace flowing from election; the idea of the justification of the individual as an element in no way especially prominent, and not in the least decisive, in the carrying out of the election which determines everything; the idea of grace as in its very nature, and therefore of necessity, bound to no order or condition etc. In short, when closely examined, with a view to its real essence and final result, the modern Missourian doctrine of election resembles that of old Calvinism as closely as one egg resembles another, and differs from it only in the inconsistency of its thinking and in the dishonesty of its polemics. This is especially true of the Amyraldine form of Calvinism; Amyraldism and modern Missourianism are genuine twin brothers (compare above, p. 37 sq.).

III.

THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

H. APPENDIX: AN ALLY OF MODERN MISSOURI IN GERMANY.

It is a well-known fact that modern Missouri,, for one thing, has disdainfully treated the almost unanimous disapproval of its doctrine among outside Lutheran theologians, as a manifestation of the synergistic spirit prevailing everywhere, and has even ventured to regard this disapproval as a proof for the correctness of her position; on the other hand, however, modern Missouri has been quick to quote with joy, as at least a partial testimony for her side, every remark, especially of one of these "synergistic" German theologians, which perhaps only halfway, or by a forced interpretation, appeared to favor her view (compare, for instance, above, p. 117 sqq.). Whether modern Missourians have made the acquaintance of the latest German scholar who takes their position more than any other of whom we know, we cannot say; they have at least made no mention of the fact. And yet he is evidently a scholarly man, a Licentiate (now perhaps already a Doctor) of theology and a professor of theology in one of the more important German universities, and takes the modern Missourian position in all that is essential. His name is Karl Müller. In the year 1892 he issued a work of 163 pages 8°, published by Niemeyer in Halle a. S., entitled: "Die göttliche Zuvorersehung und Erwählung in ihrer Bedeutung für den Heilsstand des einzelnen Gläubigen nach dem Evangelium des Paulus. Eine biblisch-thelogische Untersuchung" (The Divine Predestination and Election in its Significance for Individual Believers according to the Gospel of Paul. A Biblical-theological Study.) Our readers, who have followed us thus far in our presentation of the present doctrinal controversy, will perhaps be glad to become somewhat acquainted with the writings of this new and real German ally of modern Missouri, and this the more since his writings will be very serviceable in forming a proper estimate of the modern Missourian position.

"Whenever the free power of divine grace was recognized in the Christian Church, as alone working the salvation not only of mankind or of the Church of Christ, but also of individual believers, this faith found expression in the confession of the divine predestination and election of believers unto salvation. And just as frequently objections were raised against this doctrine by an ethically inclined speculation" (p. 1). This sounds altogether like a modern Missourian introduction; "the free power of divine grace as alone working the salvation of individual believers" finds its natural and correct expression only "in the confession of the predestination and election," i. e. as the author and modern Missouri have this confession. The following fundamental line of thought agrees equally with the modern Missourian view: "We are treating expressions of Paul's experience of faith, not a speculative problem. Accordingly, we will be compelled to reject all logical deductions which the Apostle does not state explicitly. We shall try to turn away an entire series of questions which serve only to confuse the true understanding of Paul's Gospel" (p. 3). This may indeed be correct; yet it may also be taken as a foundation for isolating, in the modern Missourian fashion, those Scripture passages which treat of election from other passages and doctrines of the Scriptures, and for adopting all sorts of logical contradictions and mysteries, and in reality it is so taken, as will appear from the following.

Our author, like modern Missouri, rejects a double predestination, unto life and unto death, as Calvin adopted it. "To be sure, the apostle could not speak of a counsel of mercy on the part of God extending over all mankind, if he harbored the opinion that God's counsel had explicitly excluded a number of individuals from salvation" (p. 13 sq.). "There remains no room for an eternal counsel of destruction extending over a part of mankind" (p. 17). "When we consider that Paul confesses a perfectly free pardoning of the sinner, supported by no claim of any kind, there appears to be, from this point of view, nothing in the way to hinder the acceptance of the particularism just described. When Paul praises the incomprehensible and wholly unmerited grace he has received, he cannot possibly find it unjust that others are not pardoned. The very humiliating experience of his own unworthiness demonstrates to him that no man has a right to demand pardon. God may justly damn all men; if He pardons some, who shall raise objections even apparently just? Because Calvin

has followed these considerations, his doctrine of the decretum horribile is infinitely nearer the true idea of Paul's Gospel than all synergistic theories which are far removed from these considerations. Still the idea of particularism cannot be carried out in the face of such expressions of the apostle as ascribe to Christ an (inclusive) all-embracing importance for the whole human race, especially in the face of passages which place the head of the old humanity, Adam, over against the head of the new humanity (Rom. 5, 12-21; 1 Cor. 15, 22). Paul could not have written thus, if he had been of the opinion that God's eternal counsel had delivered over or left a part of humanity to eternal destruction. . . . Hence this must be accepted as Pauline doctrine, that God rejects no man on account of common sinfulness, but only on account of the rejection of grace" (p. 121 sq.).

"And yet man's salvation depends exclusively upon predestination. The thought of election and predestination never meets us with the intention of explaining anything but the saved condition of believers; for this however, it is the only sufficient foundation" (p. 23). "The thought is far from Paul that God's government of the world is like that of a king which knows how to realize royal thoughts at the head of a free people. His Gospel, on the contrary, is governed by the thought that the salvation of men enslaved by sin rests only upon the eternal and free election of God's grace. The term Election with him is always made to serve the purpose of expressing sharply the freedom of divine action from all historic conditions. He knows none but an absolute election, grounded in the counsel of eternity (Rom. 8, 28, compare 33; Eph. 1, 4)." (P. 130 sq.). This entire view is also that of modern Missouri; only the author is too honest to deny with modern Missouri that election is "absolute".

And of this absolute election, conditioned upon nothing in man, we can and should be absolutely certain; so teaches our author together with modern Missouri. "In the admission that individual believers here seek the certainty of salvation, an appeal might be made to the fact that in the triumphant list of all those things that cannot separate us from Christ" (Rom. 8, 31, etc.), "death, indeed, and life, angels and principalities and powers, things present and things to come, and all other creatures appear—but that our own sin and weakness is not mentioned in this series. It might be thought that Paul desires to express only this certainty, that God knows how to protect believers

against all hostile powers of the world till they reach their eternal goal. One might think that the apostle adds the silent condition: if these believers really prove faithful. But such thoughts would contain only a small measure of truth. It was, indeed, impossible for Paul to add for instance wilful sin to the things recounted in verses 38 sq. For this is self-evident" (also in an absolute election which regards no conduct of man and is carried out irresistibly?) "that no Christian can believe himself to be predestinated from eternity, when he at the same time consciously harbors sin. As far as false, slothful security is concerned we must point to the proper admonitions. But in this case where the heart is painfully troubled by the legitimate question, whether we are able to fulfill the 'condition' of salvation, it would be cruel simply to presuppose this condition as something self-evident" (would it be cruel when God's grace makes the fulfilment of this condition truly possible for every man, yea, when He Himself fulfills it in every one who does not make this fulfilment impossible by continued wilful resistance?). "Paul is far from any attempts of putting salvation on the tottering foundation of human performance. He cannot refrain from pointing to something at least that is attached to the human subject. How else could he gain subjective certainty? But he immediately withdraws this something, the loving longing of the heart for God, from human performance, by making it a sign of divine work. In this way alone he attains the unconditioned certainty of salvation. To insert any kind of an 'if' — however much modern synergistic thought may be inclined thereto — must lead to a total misunderstanding of Paul's certainty of election" (p. 21 sq.). Who does not recognize in this the essential features of the modern Missourian argumentation?

The author speaks in all this, precisely as does modern Missouri, of election in the narrower sense, of the choice of definite individual persons unto the infallible attainment of salvation, as the passages quoted above, and also the entire purpose of his work, show. Hence he says, p. 18: "On the background of God's universal counsel of salvation we must now sketch the predestination and election of individual believers unto salvation." His idea of election includes, just as little as that of modern Missouri, the universal counsel of salvation; he takes this only as the "background" of election. Both then, the author and modern Missouri, have a different, a narrower, idea of election than the

Formula of Concord; and yet both predicate of election in their sense, the narrower one, what the Formula of Concord predicates of election in its sense, the wider one, and predicates especially of that part of election which they exclude from their idea of it. Their apparent agreement with the Formula of Concord is, therefore, in reality only a contradiction of it.

Our author also declares, in full harmony with modern Missouri, not merely as does the Formula of Concord and every faithful Lutheran, that there is much inexplicable and mysterious in the temporal execution of the eternal decrees of God regarding man's salvation, but also that there exists an insolvable contradiction for our thinking between the universal counsel of salvation and predestination itself. So we read for instance on p. 62: "It lies in the nature of the subject, that also in the doctrine of election the contradiction remains. For it is and remains a contradiction to base all salvation on the grace of God and all destruction on man's guilt." Furthermore, p. 127: "The logical incongruity between the (all-embracing) counsel of salvation and the unconditional election of individuals must simply be acknowledged."

The author's judgment regarding our old dogmaticians is also similar to that of modern Missouri. We read on p. 87 sq.: "But this did not prevent the (later) Lutheran interpreters from again choosing the old paths" (i. e. in contradiction to Luther (?) basing personal election with the most of our old teachers on God's foresight, and appealing in this to Rom. 8, 29; 11, 2 by taking προγινώσκειν in the sense of knowing in advance.) "They thought to escape absolute predestination by this means. And indeed the Lutherans, as could not well be expected otherwise, unanimously make faith foreknown of God. Over against the evident charge of Pelagianism faith was subsequently" (?) "recognized as the work of God, while the fact was gladly forgotten that hereby the advantage sought was lost." Page 89 sq.: "Thus after the manner of Origen the most dissimilar spirits come together in the interpretation which adds præscire and ידע. God's foreknowledge is not merely theoretical, but practical; His præscientia is connected with His approbatio of what is known. This interpretation, differing but apparently from that commonly received, makes the synergistic principle of tradition stand out sharply. It has been common especially in Arminian circles. Abraham Calov, Bibl. illustr. II. p. 142, 181, who wrote his commentary as a refutation of Grotius, did not contradict the Armin-

ians on this point. He is dissatisfied merely because Grotius accepts an approbatio pietatis, while he himself prefers to speak, after the manner of Lutheran scholasticism, of a prævisio fidei, and following this of an approbatio. A few of the moderns hold to this hybrid interpretation, generally hiding their synergism by indefinite explanations, and touching in part with the sound of their words the true explanation. Also the utterances of von Hofmann ('Römerbrief' 347 sq., 464), concerning a 'right cognition' as an 'act of appropriation aiming at acquaintance with things akin', I must put into this category." So then according to our author, as well as according to modern Missouri, the mode of teaching employed by our old dogmaticians includes synergism, or it does not explain what it means to explain. It is honest on his part that he designates von Hofmann, whom modern Missourians quoted for their side on the meaning of προγινώσκειν (see above, p. 117 sqq.), as essentially agreeing with our old teachers.

As may already be seen by the foregoing, our author's explanation in regard to προγινώσκειν, Rom. 8, 29 etc., is essentially the same as that of modern Missouri. Like modern Missourians he is at great trouble to demonstrate that this expression does not mean to say what our old teachers found in it, that it is therefore no proof for the Scripturalness of their doctrine. Thus we read for instance on page 93: "προγινώσκειν must in some way predicate a decree of God." Page 97 sq.: "At any rate it must be held fast that προγινώσκειν, γινώσκειν (ידע) is a complete idea in itself, needing only one object. There exists no reason for translating and interpreting γινώσκειν and its composites in the Pauline epistles, where these words with a simple object speak of God's relation to man, in any other way but this of free election unto salvation." Entirely the same view as that of modern Missouri (compare above, p. 117).

Accordingly our author has exactly the same position as modern Missouri in all essential points. He is flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone, in spite of a few variations in minor points their genuine and true brother in the faith as far as the doctrine of predestination is concerned. And this man is a regular Professor of Reformed Theology in the University of Erlangen, called to this position after the publication of his work on election, and most likely called there in part because of this work. He therefore knows where he belongs, and the authorities who called him also

know where he belongs: his doctrinal position stamps him as Reformed, even if he does not agree with Calvin in all things. His fundamental view is the Reformed as distinguished from the Lutheran. And what then is the modern Missourian view which is like his in all that is essential, as like as one egg is to another?

IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION IN THE OHIO SYNOD.

From the very beginning, from the year 1872 till the year 1881, the Ohio Synod belonged to the Synodical Conference and sent delegates to every one of its meetings. She was next to the Norwegian Synod in her friendly relations to the Missouri Synod. Not infrequently unpleasant scenes occurred at the meetings of the Synodical Conference between the delegates of the Missouri Synod and those of the Wisconsin and of the Minnesota Synods, especially of the former, and there was open talk of "another spirit"; but the synodical intercourse between Ohio and Missouri was always peaceful and considerate. Not long before the outbreak of the predestination controversy one of the leading men of the Ohio Synod, Dr. M. Loy, was chosen to fill a theological professorship in the Seminary at St. Louis, while Dr. Schmidt and the author of the present sketch were already not sufficiently orthodox to be considered candidates for such a position. Although other intentions of no praiseworthy character helped to prompt the call of Dr. Loy, yet this call shows that as far as the "spirit" of Ohio was concerned, which was represented in Dr. Loy, because of his position and activity, as much as in any other man, Missouri had no serious objections to offer. As far as public doctrine was concerned there was, of course, full unanimity among the synods constituting the Synodical Conference, since this body had been formed for the very purpose of being a representative and bulwark of pure doctrine and practice in our land, also over against other bodies calling themselves Lutheran. As we have already shown (above, p. 53 sqq.), up to the year 1877 all could in charity believe, in fact were bound to believe, that in spite of a few strange or even wrong expressions, Missouri still held fast in all uprightness and seriousness to the doctrine which "the theologians of our Church in the 17th century have taught on predestination and defended against the Calvinists." To deny this would have been to declare Dr. Walther and the entire Missouri Synod, which had

silently acknowledged as its own the solemn declaration he made in her name in this regard, guilty of hypocrisy and deception. The very fact that this solemn declaration appeared about a month before the first meeting of the Synodical Conference, and called forth no protest or anything of the kind on the part of the Ohio Synod, proves conclusively that the latter agreed with Hunnius, Hutter, Gerhard, etc., in the doctrine of predestination, although, perhaps, a few of her members may have shared Dr. Walther's dislike of the expression "election in view of faith", and may have occasionally expressed this opinion. The authority of Dr. Walther as the chief representative of Lutheran orthodoxy was so great in the Missouri Synod and in the Synodical Conference, that one was glad to adopt his views and expressions where it could be done with a good conscience, especially when one knew by past unpleasant experiences how easily he took offense at modes of expression and argumentation differing from his own, and suspected danger in them. Thus the Ohio Synod also used and recommended the Lutheran doctrinal and devotional works, Dieterich's Catechism, the Weimar Bible, Scriver's "Seelenschatz", (Treasure of the Soul) Masius' "Unterscheidungslehren" (Distinctive Doctrines), the old dogmaticians and their summary in Schmid's Dogmatics, in all of which the doctrine of an election in view of faith was explicitly taught. All this could not have been done in honesty, if the Synod had not agreed with the doctrine of the old dogmaticians, if it had favored the modern Missourian doctrine.

In the autumn of 1877 the well known meeting of the Western District of the Missouri Synod was held, and here a fundamental view in regard to the doctrine of predestination and conversion revealed itself, which, after close examination, could no longer be regarded as the Lutheran view, although a proper estimate of it was rendered very difficult by the constantly recurring appeal to the assent also of the old dogmaticians, who were known to Dr. Walther, the theseist and chief speaker at this meeting, as to no other man. It was hardly possible to think and believe that Dr. Walther, the pillar of orthodoxy, had really stepped upon un-Lutheran, Calvinistic ground. For months the attempt was made "to find a Biblical-Lutheran meaning in the erroneous propositions of Dr. Walther," and even when it became apparent that this was in vain and impossible, those who were concerned shrank from publicly opposing the new doctrine and counseled against

such opposition, until all possible private means had been exhausted for adjusting the doctrinal difference (compare above, p. 106 sqq.). Then, too, not everybody, especially in the other synods of the Synodical Conference, found time and opportunity for a close examination of this Report of the Western District immediately after its appearance. It was no wonder therefore, that no one publicly raised his voice at the 7th meeting of the Synodical Conference, in July, 1878, at Ft. Wayne, against the report of C. A. Frank, at that time professor, who was entrusted with an examination of this Western Report, and who had nothing but words of praise for "the glorious doctrinal discussions on predestination." Most of the delegates of the Ohio Synod, as perhaps also those of other synods, the delegates of the Missouri Synod not excepted, without doubt did not know precisely what this Report contained, and the few who did know its contents more or less precisely, and who had their doubts in this regard, shrank from coming out publicly as long as all other means for coming to an understanding had not been exhausted. Whether now this course is approved or not, the fact that no voice was raised publicly against Prof. Frank's report assuredly does not prove that all the delegates present, especially also those of the Ohio Synod, agreed at that time with the fundamental view in the Report of the Western District of the Missouri Synod, which, moreover, was still veiled in various ways.

At the colloquium, which took place in July, 1879, between Dr. Walther and Prof. Schmidt at Columbus, O., it certainly appeared that the theological leaders of the Ohio Synod were not ready to follow the former in his erroneous Calvinistic course, but were determined to abide by the old Lutheran doctrine. The same thing appeared at the colloquium in January, 1881, held at Milwaukee between the professors and presidents of the Synodical Conference (see "Zeitblätter" 1882, p. 214-228). At its close "Crœmer yet made a sorrowful attempt to separate the Ohioans from Schmidt. But Loy made the fine reply, that, in case of open controversy, it could not be in the least doubtful which side he would espouse." And he was true to his word. Since all hope for ending the strife in private had vanished, after a series of purely positive articles, stating and defending the old Lutheran doctrine of election in view of faith, had already been published in the Lutheran Standard, edited by Dr. Loy, there appeared in February, 1881, The Columbus Theological Magazine, published

and edited by Dr. Loy. Its very first article, "The Burning Question", took a clear and unequivocal stand, as well thetically as antithetically. The circumstance that the Magazine made its first appearance just at this time is declared to be a result of the new doctrine introduced by Dr. Walther and his adherents. In Christian charity their integrity is not doubted; but "that they have erred, and have troubled Israel by promulgating their error, is our sincere conviction." "For three hundred years there has, by the admission of all parties, been in the Lutheran Church an established doctrine, which the Missouri Synod is now striving to displace. It is taught with one consent by all the prominent writers of the Church throughout that period. There was no other in vogue that claimed the Lutheran name. That is the doctrine which we maintain and defend." "Election in its strict sense is thus only a part of the general decree of salvation, not a coordinate factor that enters as a disturbing element. The purpose of God from eternity is to save all them that believe. By His foreknowledge He saw from the beginning who among the multitudes of men would become believers. These He elected. Our theologians therefore call foreknowledge the eye of election, without which it would be blind. It is not a cause of predestination, but simply the means of recognizing, humanly speaking, the persons whom it was God's purpose to adopt and save, i. e. of discerning the faith which distinguishes the accepted in the Beloved from the rejected in their unbelief. Not even faith is strictly a cause. That which moves God to elect is His grace and the merits of His beloved Son; the former is the internal, the latter the external moving cause. Faith is merely the divine requisite without which, in the purpose of God, the causes of election could not be operative in the individuals." The following objections are raised against the modern Missourian doctrine: 1. It is "an outgrowth of philosophical speculation," "an effort by the finite mind to solve an insoluble mystery," namely the mystery that, although God's will is to save all men, still only a few are saved in reality. 2. It is damaging to the revealed doctrine of God and His attributes, in that it asserts that God has not chosen the majority of mankind, although He could have chosen them. 3. It contradicts sound exegetical principles, refusing to have Scripture interpreted by Scripture. 4. It "endangers the great central doctrine of justification by faith and thus threatens to revolutionize our whole doctrinal system", by refusing to give faith its decisive position.

5. "It undermines the precious Biblical doctrine of the means of grace" claiming that these cannot save man without the particular grace of election. 6. It is destructive of the comfort which the Gospel is designed to bring, for it makes particular election decide everything from the start, The following articles also attack the false doctrine of Missouri severely, yet always by purely positive arguments, honoring the person and motives of the opponent, and this in spite of the personal turn which Dr. Walther and "F. P." as his eager second had given to the controversy from the beginning. The Magazine, too, does not hesitate to declare (for instance, p. 216 sqq. 238), with our old teachers and with the Confession, that election did not take place without all regard to man's foreseen "conduct" toward the means of grace and the Holy Spirit operating through them (compare above, p. 166 sqq.).

On the 8th of September of the same year, 1881, the Joint Synod of Ohio and Adjacent States assembled at Wheeling, W. Va., for an extra session rendered necessary by the predestination controversy. The subject to be considered was, first of all, the position of Synod in this controversy, and its present relation to the Synodical Conference. After a protracted and thorough discussion the following resolution was voted upon: "We herewith confess anew the doctrine of predestination as it is contained in the Formula of Concord, and as in general it has ever been taught by the fathers of our Church; especially do we hold the doctrine of our fathers, that the ordination of the elect unto eternal life has taken place in view of faith, i. e. of Christ's merit apprehended by faith, to be Scriptural and Symbolical, and therefore truly Lutheran. Therefore, be it resolved: That the doctrine here confessed by us anew be, as in the past, so also in the future, the only doctrine authorized in our institutions, schools, publications, and churches." One hundred and ten pastors and 33 delegates voted for this resolution, and 8 pastors and 3 delegates against it. Nearly all those pastors who were not present and those congregations not represented by delegates received this resolution as expressing also their conviction. Those pastors who continued in their oppostiton to this resolution, more, as it appeared, because of their attachment to Missouri and especially to Dr. Walther, than because of a clearly conscious agreement with the new doctrine of Missouri, formed, at first, so as to draw their congregations more easily with them, an orginization of their own, ostensibly apart from and above the contending Synods, but dissolved this a

few years after and entered the Missouri Synod. That resolution, although ridiculed by the St. Louis men because of its somewhat imperfect form, nevertheless states the position of the Synod in clear and altogether unambiguous terms, and declares in an unmistakable manner what has been the doctrine of the Ohio Synod on this point before and after this synodical meeting and up to the present day, and what, God willing, shall remain its doctrine, in spite of all the perversions and vilifications of modern Missouri. In our "Lutherische Kirchenzeitung" for the 15th of October, 1881, this resolution is explained more fully over against all attempted perversions (p. 345 sq. and 348 sq.).—As regarded her relation to the Synodical Conference, the Synod resolved to withdraw from this body, at the same time expressing her deep regret that such a step should have become necessary; for the Missouri Synod, by her conduct hitherto toward all serious opponents of the new doctrine, had frustrated every hope of profitably discussing the doctrinal difference at the meetings of the Synodical Conference which she controlled. The course of the following meeting of this body, in which Dr. Schmidt, although a legitimate delegate of the Norwegian Synod, was not permitted to defend himself, proved the wisdom of this resolution.

Whoever desires to inform himself further concerning the standpoint of the Ohio Synod, as opposed to the modern Missourian error in its manifold ramifications and offshoots, must be referred especially to her theological periodicals, the above mentioned Theological Magazine and the "Theologische Zeitblätter", which appeared one year later. The present work is, of course, also written from the standpoint of the Ohio Synod, and may thus serve to elucidate it. The impartial reader will find that this Synod desires and does nothing but hold fast to the old Lutheran, and at the same time old Missourian, standpoint over against all human sophistries and pretended "reformatory" innovations. The objections brought against this position by Missouri are the same as those that have always been brought by Calvinists against Lutherans, without their being able to prove them legitimate. In the eyes of Calvinists, Lutherans have always been Semi-Pelagians and synergists. When therefore modern Missouri calls the Ohio Synod synergistic for understanding the Confession and the Scriptures as the Lutheran Church has always understood them, she simply proves that she is dominated by the spirit and fundamental views of Calvinism.

"INTUITU FIDEI"

BY REV. PROF. F. A. SCHMIDT, D. D.,

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

REV. R. C. H. LENSKI, A. M.,

AND

REV. C. B. GOHDES, A. M.

PART I.

WHAT WERE THE CONTENTS OR THE SUBSTANCE OF THE DOCTRINE, TAUGHT BY OUR LUTHERAN CHURCH FATHERS, THAT GOD ELECTED IN VIEW OF FAITH?

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

1) Over against Romanism our Lutheran Church holds fast the maxim, that we are justified and saved Sola Fide, i. e. by faith alone. To be sure, these words as they stand are not found recorded in the Bible, and therefore the papists always delight in demanding of us to show where "by faith alone" is written. But the thing itself is found clearly and explicitly in the Scriptures. Over against Calvinism Intuitu Fidei, i. e. in view of faith (God has chosen sinners unto salvation) has similarly come to be a watchword in the Lutheran Church. Of this expression it must likewise be said that it is not found recorded in the Bible; nevertheless it is just as scriptural as the Sola Fide, for the real meaning and true sense of this terse formula is one of the precious doctrines revealed in the Gospel.

2) Sola Fide and Intuitu Fidei are at bottom only two different formulas to express the same fundamental Gospel truth. God's gracious will in Christ Jesus toward us sinners is in its essence one and the same will, whether we regard it as it comes to be carried out in time (in actually justifying and saving sinners), or look at it as fixing the order of salvation already in eternity, and choosing in accordance therewith, by virtue of God's omniscient foreknowledge, each and every single person unto salvation, before the foundations of the world were laid. Sinners are justified and saved, not by works or merits of their own, but alone by faith in God's Son; because faith alone is the proper means on man's part for partaking of Christ's atonement and merit, and thereby also of God's grace unto salvation. To say that by Sola Fide we again set up a certain work and merit on man's part, would, among thinking Lutherans at least, appear

simply ridiculous. And yet by Sola Fide we do not mean to say that faith is merely an instrument in God's hands for carrying out the already fixed decree of justification and salvation — a means employed on God's part in actually justifying and saving certain men already otherwise predestined thereto. No; faith itself, inasmuch as it embraces Christ's merit, is the thing that decides who is to be justified and saved. Before God faith constitutes the difference between those who are to partake of Christ's merit unto justification and salvation, and those who are not to partake of it. It is precisely the same with the Intuitu Fidei; the only difference is that here the primary emphasis is laid not upon the exclusion of all human work, merit, and worthiness, but upon the exclusion of the Calvinistic absolute (mere, unconditional, arbitrary) will of God. Our fathers never dreamed of infringing in any way upon the grace of God or the merits of Christ, by holding fast the Sola Fide; on the contrary, they meant to emphasize this grace of God and merit of Christ fully over against all human merit and worthiness. And in exactly the same way it never entered their heads to uphold in the least man's own merit or worthiness by the Intuitu Fidei. In both instances the thing at stake is Christ's merit, which alone is valid; and faith comes in only in so far as it is the one and only means, ordained of God, for embracing Christ's saving merit. On the other hand, our fathers, in holding the Sola Fide, never imagined that God had no regard to anything in the sinner whom He desired to justify and save; they therefore never for a moment supposed that God, by virtue of His free and wholly absolute pleasure, would take here one and there another and make them partakers of Christ's righteousness and merit, thus having regard to faith only as a means for carrying out this absolute decree. And much less did this thought enter the minds of our godly and orthodox fathers when they used the term Intuitu Fidei. On the contrary, it was their very purpose by this orthodox shibboleth to contradict the error of an absolute election, and of a faith which is only a means for realizing, or compelling the execution of ("Durchsetzung"), a fixed decree; they meant this expression to be an obvious and immovable landmark, to indicate the boundary line between Calvinistic absolutism and evangelical Lutheranism. Our fathers desired to ward off two opposing errors: the Romish doctrine of works,

and the Calvinistic doctrine of arbitrary grace. The Sola Fide rejected the former directly, and indirectly also the latter. The Intuitu Fidei, however, rejected the latter directly, and indirectly also the former. For in neither case is faith treated as a meritorious act or virtue, whose worth is measured by the Law, inasmuch as it fulfills a command of God. In both instances it is regarded solely as the means on man's part, ordained in the gracious counsel of God, for embracing the allsufficient merit of Christ.

3) Dr. Samuel Huber plays a peculiar role in the history of the Intuitu Fidei. The Colloquium at Moempelgart between Jacob Andreæ and Theo. Beza (1586) had made him a sworn enemy of Calvinism. He moved from Switzerland into Wuertemberg, and accepted a pastorate in Derendingen. On the 25th of September, 1592, Stephan Gerlach arranged a disputation against the Calvinists, at Tuebingen. The following theses came up: "Although God has chosen us in His grace, without any merit on our part, this was not without regard to Christ's obedience (in whom alone there is salvation, Acts 4, 12). — Therefore we say that we are chosen in Christ as our Head, through Christ as the one who brings us unto grace, Eph. 1. . . . Consequently we must of necessity conclude, that election has not been without regard to faith (necessario infertur, electionem absque intuitu fidei non factam esse), and that therefore God's efficient grace, Christ's meritorious obedience, and our appropriating faith are indissolubly joined together. For to believe, that election took place in Christ as our Head, and through Christ as our Mediator, who Himself is the Book of Life; to believe furthermore, that we are in Christ only through faith, and that without faith His blessings do not help us: this is saying, that alone through faith in His blood (sola fide in sanguinem ejus) our names are written in the album of heaven. Although this faith was then not actually present as it is now, it was by no means absent in the eyes of God. He lives in a changeless present; all things are before Him without a difference in time; and nothing can escape His foreknowledge (if we may be permitted to employ a word referring to ourselves who live in time). For this reason election is said to have taken place (Rom. 8, 29) according to the foreknowledge of God, that is according to His foreknowledge of faith and of perseverance; for His foreknowledge is always

such when applied to things in time. And Christ affirms this condition explicitly, Mark 16, 16: 'He that believeth shall be saved.' And 2 Thess. 2, 13: 'God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth.' [See the Greek. — Translator.] Yet we dare not conclude from this that election took place for the sake of faith as a certain kind of merit, as the Calvinists would maliciously impute to us, laying Pelagianism at our door, and are not ashamed of drawing the most unreasonable conclusions.* We see the same thing in justification; it too takes place only through faith, and yet we do not teach that it takes place for the sake of faith as though faith constituted a certain merit. Therefore, the doctrine of Calvinists is erroneous, since they declare that election took place absolutely, without the slightest regard to the faith of those who were to be elected."

These propositions were first assailed by a certain pastor (probably Mæuslin), with whom Huber had spoken, stating to him, and also to several students, his disagreement with the theses. When the matter was discussed with Huber at a convention, he laid stress on two points: 1) Faith is no cause of our election; 2) God's grace and predestination are the same thing, and hence apply directly to the whole human race. The Acta Huberiana report, Vol. 1, p. 16: "On the first point he received the answer, that we too do not regard faith as a cause of our election and justification before God in the sense that man is elected or justified propter quam or for the sake of faith. Nevertheless, faith cannot be excluded either from our election or from our justification, since no one is justified or saved without faith, and accordingly, absque consideratione fidei, quatenus ea Christum apprehendit, i. e. without faith, in so far as it embraces Christ, no one is chosen unto salvation. In regard to his second objection he was shown, that it was certainly correct to speak of God's universal decree unto salvation, of His counsel and will, desiring that grace should be shown to the entire human

* Gerlach's doctrine concerning the relation between election and faith, as here set forth, was therefore nothing new; it was a well-known point of controversy between Calvinists and Lutherans. Already in the Colloquium at Moempelgart Beza controverted this doctrine as the well-known and common teaching of Lutherans, seeking to find Pelagianism in it. From whom did Missouri learn this art of drawing unreasonable conclusions?

race, help and rescue provided from eternal destruction, etc.; — God has not overlooked a single person, or excluded any one from His grace. . . . . But this detracts nothing whatever from the Electioni speciali, i. e. from the divine predestination, which pertains only to the believing children of God. For it was never God's will or determination to save any one apart from faith or without faith. Those who see their sins and place their trust in Christ and strive to live a holy life, they (and none others) are to be regarded as God's chosen children. And accordingly we must not only inquire, whom God would like to save, and to whom He is ready to grant salvation, but, when we speak of divine predestination according to the Christian Formula Concordiæ, we must consider, who they are that are saved according to God's eternal counsel, namely those who embrace by faith God's universal gracious will, and persevere unto the end." At last Huber "declared himself satisfied with this statement, but still considered it questionable to put faith into the definition or description of God's predestination. However, he desired to be excused if he had been, or still was, wrong in this. And here the matter was permitted to rest for the present." Soon after this he was called to Wittenberg to labor by the side of Leyser and Hunnius. Here again he attempted to bring out his confused ideas, and gained quite a following by his writings and travels. Finally, however, it became plain that he was merely a muddled head, and he lost ground completely. He died in 1624.

4) To aid in the correct understanding of the testimonies which we intend to quote from the fathers, it will be well to place the three older doctrines concerning the relation of faith to election, side by side.

a) The Calvinists teach, that the elective decree of God applies to certain individual sinners in Adam, according to the mere free pleasure of God; and that this decree predestinates them at once unto salvation itself, and thereby also unto all the means necessary for its attainment (to which means faith belongs).

b) Huber teaches that God has chosen all men directly unto salvation and unto faith, for God's universal love toward the human race is itself predestination; hence predestination is not limited to God's believing children, nor dare it be in any way regarded as having taken place only through foreseen faith.

c) The Lutherans teach, that there is a distinction between God's universal grace and predestination; for the latter is subordinate to the former, and (strictly taken) consists of a single definite decree within the universal counsel of grace; i. e. the decree which determines irrevocably which individuals among the great mass of sinners are to attain salvation without fail. This fixed and final decree concerning the attainment of salvation dare not be confused with the decree concerning the redemption of the whole world, nor with that concerning the call to grace (Matt. 20, 16), nor with that concerning justification (since many of the justified fall away). This fixed decree of predestination, furthermore, was not formed in regard to sinners without faith, neither in regard to all, as Huber dreamed, nor in regard to some, as the Calvinists dream. On the contrary this decree of salvation was formed in regard to sinners foreseen as believing in Christ; and this in accordance with the rule revealed clearly in the Gospel as God's eternal will: "He that believeth shall be saved," and: "Without faith it is impossible to please God." —

5) Now Missouri has discovered an entirely original path through the midst of these doctrines. Missouri accepts what Huber and the Calvinists teach over against Lutherans on the question, whether faith (in God's foresight) already decided a man's salvation in predestination; declaring that election did not take place through (foreseen) faith, but unto faith. Besides this Missouri also teaches what Huber maintained over against the Lutherans and the Calvinists, namely universal grace, redemption, and vocation. And finally, the contention of the Calvinists over against Huber and the Lutherans, that election unto salvation and unto all means necessary for attaining it, is a particular election, embracing only certain individual persons, according to a secret purpose of God — this especially Missouri teaches and upholds as the palladium of its anti-synergism. But alas, Missouri obstinately denies and rejects the very thing held fast by the Lutherans at that time over against Huber as well as the Calvinists, and defended against their united attacks as one of the central doctrines of the pure Gospel; namely this, that election unto salvation took place in view of Christ's merit as apprehended by faith; or, which is the same, in view of faith as apprehending Christ's merit. On this point Missouri stands

decidedly on the side of Huber and the Calvinists and in opposition to the acknowledged orthodox Lutherans. Neither Huber nor any of the Calvinists could have expressed the sentiments of his heart more clearly than did Missouri when it wrote: "We have come to see that the Scriptures do not furnish the least ground for the assumption that foreseen faith constituted a condition or presupposition in the divine act of election. On the contrary, by describing election or predestination as a free act of God's will grounded in God, and in Christ alone, the Scriptures exclude all regard to man's conduct" ("Lehre und Wehre," 1880, 232). "Predestination is the foundation and cause of our salvation, and of everything pertaining thereto. How could this be, if faith constituted the cause on account of which we are chosen? No; faith, indeed, must be present in election; it does not enter our minds to say that a man can be saved without faith, or that God did not think of faith in election. To be sure, He thought of faith, but only as a means through which man is to be saved, as something to be given to man and preserved for him on the basis of election" (Report of the Western District, 1880, 32).

6. In spite of this, Missouri declares concerning the old zealous defenders of the Intuitu Fidei: "We desire to hold fast, and do indeed hold fast, the doctrine of Luther and Chemnitz concerning predestination, as expressed in the Formula of Concord." (We assuredly believe this, but — how can Missouri really believe it?) "We by no means wish to accuse the later dogmaticians of teaching a false doctrine of predestination" ("L. and W.," 1880, 68). "They by no means attempted to correct in any way the pure, biblical, and symbolical doctrine of predestination, by employing the questionable term 'intuitu fidei.' On the contrary they held fast to this doctrine none the less with all earnestness" (p. 98). This is what Missouri declares repeatedly on the one hand.

On the other hand, however, Missouri is not deterred by these testimonials in favor of our fathers from declaring the following in its official organ:

"It admits of no doubt whatever that the dogmaticians of the 17th century in some way made election depend on faith, although they differ greatly in defining the manner of this dependence. Whenever they set up the intuitu fidei as a shibboleth; whenever they take the expression, that God has chosen

those whose faith He foresaw, in the same sense; whenever they revert to the so-called Syllogismus prædestinatorius*, according to which election follows logically from God's gracious will and from His foreknowledge of faith: then they state the dependence of election upon faith. They attempt to explain, in a manner at least, this wonderful mystery of the discretio personarum (the separation of persons), and to make it plausible to reason. And herein they have erred and have deviated from the Scriptures and the Confession. Herein we do not agree with them" ("L. and W.," 1882, 158).

Should some one feel bold enough to put the modest question, how such contradictory statements can be reconciled, he would be served with the answer: Thou must simply believe both!

7) At the meeting of the Synodical Conference in Chicago the doctrinal standpoint of the fathers, as the Report shows, came up repeatedly for discussion. The Norwegian "brethren" especially exerted themselves to the utmost in trying to induce the Conference to declare that "the old teachers of our Church" did not harbor false doctrine in employing the expression "in view of faith." But the Conference did not venture, either to acknowledge as correct the substance of the doctrine "in view of faith," nor to reject this doctrine as an antiscriptural error of the fathers. A little back door was found, and with nimble dexterity the uncomfortable task was avoided. Afterwards Dr. Walther remarked in "L. and W.", that the attempt to move the Synodical Conference to declare itself with reference to the doctrine of the fathers, was a "trap," into which the Conference, "by the grace of God," did not permit itself to be decoyed. Indeed, a very vexatious trap! This is how Missouri plays its dishonorable game, and in this regard leaves even the Crypto-Calvinists far behind.

8) We now proceed to quote quite a complete selection of utterances from acknowledged orthodox publications and teachers on the doctrine known throughout the Lutheran Church as

---

* I. e. the three parts of the decree of election: 1. (Purpose) All those who accept Christ in faith shall be received unto the adoption and inheritance of eternal life; 2. (Foresight) This man and that man and the other — David, Paul, Luther, etc. — do accept Christ in faith; 3. (Conclusion in the election) These, therefore, shall be chosen, etc.

"Election in View of Faith." In some of these quotations the doctrine is briefly stated and characterized, in others it is fully explained and defended against misunderstandings and malicious misrepresentations. We turn especially to writings belonging to the time of the Formula of Concord and coming from men who either helped compose the Confession (Chytræus, Selnecker, Chemnitz, Andreæ), or were its original subscribers (Leyser, Mylius, Backmeister, Heerbrand, Magirus, Biedenbach, Binder, Holder, and others) or were known as its efficient promulgators and defenders (Hunnius*).

If the doctrine of election in view not merely of Christ's merit as obtained for us, but of this merit as apprehended by faith, really involved a defection from the pure Confession; if this doctrine had really been branded and rejected by the Epitome† as "a blasphemous and dreadful false doctrine" — then it is altogether incredible, that a universal storm of indignation was not raised by the original subscribers (of whom thousands were then still living, 12-20 years after the promulgation of the Formula) against these Pelagianizing innovators; and that they did not at once proceed to establish the true and original sense of the Formula of Concord and maintain it victoriously over against the deserters!

---

* Ægidius Hunnius became professor at Marburg in 1576. He attended the general synod at Kassel, which assembled from the 24th of August till the 4th of September of the same year. The subject before the synod was the adoption of the Formula of Concord, then still called "The Book of Torgau," and Hunnius proved himself to be the "readiest and most powerful champion of the Concordia" (Heppe).

† Where it declares that the assertion, that not only the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ, but also in us is a cause of God's election — meaning, of course, an independent, co-ordinate, third cause — "should not be tolerated in the Church of God."

A. AUTHORS OF THE FORMULA OF CONCORD.*

David Chytræus writes in his Commentary on Rev., p. 373: "The norm and rule of the last judgment will be simple, easily comprehended, certain, and irreversible. The book of life, the decisive sentence of judgment, which refers to all mankind in the same way, without any respect of persons, is clearly expressed in the words: 'God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. He that believeth on Him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already.' All those, then, not written in the Lamb's book of life will, without distinction, be cast as accursed into the eternal fire, as the end of this book declares. And at the close of the 21st chapter he adds that no one can be a citizen of the holy Jerusalem, or of the heavenly Church, who has not been inscribed in the Lamb's book of life. But in this book of life are inscribed, i. e. elected to eternal life, all men who believe in Christ, the Lamb of God that bears the sins of the world, the Giver of life eternal, and who persevere in this faith till the end. During life this faith shows itself in works of mercy or good deeds towards our fellow men, or in all the duties of love toward God and our fellow men, and shines before men. Therefore, those who are inscribed in the book of life are called, Matt. 25, 34, 'the blessed of the Father,' who shall inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of

* Translator's Note. — In the text of the Intuitu Fidei only brief quotations are made from the authors of the F. C. A note refers us to "Altes und Neues," No. 14 and the following, of 1882 (meaning, however, 1881), where the authors of the F. C. are quoted at full length. Instead of the abbreviated extracts given in the Intuitu Fidei itself we therefore insert "the testimonies" as given in full in 1881. A translation of these fuller extracts was printed in the "Columbus Theological Magazine" for 1882, under the heading: "Some Testimonies of the Authors of the Formula of Concord in Regard to Election"; but the original has here been retranslated almost throughout. The "Magazine" omitted the appended notes entirely; they are here introduced. A few important notes are found appended to the briefer extracts in the Intuitu Fidei proper; these also are added and inserted where they belong.

the world. For all the nations shall be blessed, that is, they are delivered from sin and death, they obtain the inheritance of the heavenly kingdom and righteousness and eternal life, solely and alone for the sake of the seed of Abraham as apprehended by faith, Gal. 3. And Eph. 1, 3-4, we read: 'God hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world.' Therefore Paul says, Rom. 6, 23; 'The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.' And Eph. 2, 8: 'By grace ye are saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, lest any man should boast.'"

II.

On Rev. 13, 8, the same Chytræus writes: "Although the multitude of those who without scruple worship idols is great and vast, and although even in the mass composing the Christian Church the majority, either charmed by the power and conquests of the beast, or overcome by fear, fall away from the true God and worship the beast, nevertheless God at all times preserves among the human race a holy seed, or a church of those elected to eternal life. These are they who are inscribed in the Lamb's book of life; i. e. before the foundation of the world, of pure grace on account of His Son Jesus Christ, who is our Savior and the Lamb that was slain for the sins of the world, these have been called and elected by the preaching of the Gospel unto eternal life, that they might to all eternity rejoice in the wisdom, justice, life, and salvation of God, and thus praise and glorify God. Now the figure contained in this expression (whose names are inscribed in the book of life) is taken from the usual custom of cities and corporations that have certain books in which the names of the citizens are kept on record. But here we must not imagine that God has Stoic tablets* or tablets of the Fates,† on which the names of certain persons are enrolled who of absolute necessity must be saved, whether they hear or despise the Word of God, whether they believe in Christ, the Lamb slain for our sins, or

* The Stoics were disciples of the Greek philosopher Zeno and taught that all things take place absolutely of necessity, and that complete indifference is therefore the highest wisdom and virtue.

† The Fates were three Greek goddesses, who allotted to each man his destiny; everything finally depended on their decisions.

not; and in like manner the names of others who of necessity must be condemned. On the contrary, we must remember that we are to draw our conclusions concerning election and predestination from nothing save the Word of God, who is true and just, disposed alike toward all, and in whom there is no respect of persons; and also from the promise of the Gospel, which is universal and offered gratuitously. Thus then are written in the book of life, or elected by God to eternal life, all men who believe in Christ, the Lamb of God that bears the sins of the world, and who persevere in faith to their last breath. As we read in John 6, 40: 'This is the will of the Father, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life.' And John 1, 12: 'As many as received Him, to them He gave power to become the sons of God.' Rev. 2, 10: 'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.'* Eph. 1, 4: 'He hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world.' 1 Peter 1, 20: 'Ye are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as a lamb without blemish and without spot; who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world.' "

III.

In his exposition of the Catechism Chytræus writes, p. 84: "Predestination is the eternal decree of the will (mentis) of God, by which, of free grace and mercy on account of His Son, He has selected an eternal church, that is, persons who are pleasing to Him, and are heirs of eternal life. The members of this church are all those individuals who receive the Gospel of Christ in faith and persevere in this faith to the end of life, according to the words: 'Blessed are they who die in the Lord.' 'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life.' "

IV.

When the Huber controversy broke out, and the Wittenberg and Wuertemberg theologians referred election only to believers as such, and Huber taught that all men were chosen, the aged Chytræus also, the only surviving co-author of the Formula of Concord, was forced to raise his weighty voice. He decided

* Cf. Rev. 3, 5: "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before His angels."

against Huber, and for his opponents; therefore, too, Hunnius afterwards (but still during the lifetime of Chytræus) emphatically appealed to the fact that this Rostock prince of theologians had read and approved of his writings on predestination. If Chemnitz had already before this time refused to call predestination particular, without further explaining the term, "because this might be understood to mean that God's intention had not been to save all men," in the case of Chytræus it comes out even more clearly and distinctly what was the sense of the authors of the Formula of Concord when, in treating of the doctrine of election, they took their stand with such immovable firmness on the universal promises of the Gospel. For, if among the acts of grace on the part of God for the welfare of men, at least election to salvation were simply particular, then the entire gracious will of God to save sinners would, in its innermost essence, be likewise particular; for whomsoever God did not will to elect, him also He did not will to save. But if, on the other hand, the gracious will to save sinners is universal, and if this universality is real, then God on His part must have desired to save all. Accordingly, Chytræus and his Rostock colleagues write to the Wittenberg theologians, under date of July 4, 1595, as follows: "In regard to the use of the expression 'universal election,' we repeat what we have said: If it will not do to call the will of God in Christ, according to which He earnestly desires the salvation of man, a universal predestination, it is certainly improper to raise a great controversy merely about the words, as long as what is really necessary, the wholesome, comforting doctrine, is held fast. As long as there is agreement in the thing itself, we should be ready to yield as regards the use of terms. Now we do not doubt but what there is devout agreement between us in this entire chapter concerning predestination. Therefore both sides may retain the term universal election; meaning, of course, that the foreordination of those who are to be saved (which is the point of controversy, and of which the Formula of Concord treats) is really and truly universal as regards all individuals, Jews or Gentiles, who have learned to know the Son of God and Savior of the world in faith, and remain therein till the end of life. In the same way the righteousness of God by faith in Christ Jesus is universal for all and over all that believe. For there is here no difference, Rom. 3. Those, however, who will not believe remain under the judgment and wrath of God to eternity. Therefore,

too, they are not called elect but reprobate." In the same letter we read furthermore: "The merciful will of God, burning in love for the whole human race, desires that all men shall be chosen in Christ, justified, and saved, and this through faith in Christ. But since all do not believe, God does not regard all alike as chosen, nor grant righteousness and eternal life to them in Christ; although He desired concerning them all that they should have been elected and saved, if they had believed (quos tamen omnes voluisset eligi et salvari, si credidissent). We have told Huber several times, and repeated it during our last conversation, when he took leave of us, that the real and complete definition of election, according to the Holy Scriptures and the Book of Concord, embraces not only the merciful will of God or the merits of Christ and the universal promises of the Gospel, but also true and constant faith in this mercy of God and in Christ, the Mediator and Redeemer of the whole human race, because Christ without faith avails nothing, and all the promises of God explicitly demand faith."

V.

Dr. Jacob Andreæ is, besides Chemnitz, one of the main authors of the Formula of Concord. He was far more active than even Chemnitz himself in bringing matters so far that the Formula was produced. In the year 1574 he published a disputation on predestination in which thesis 10 reads as follows: "Predestination and election by grace is the eternal decree of God, declaring that He will save those persons who are penitent and believe in Christ, the Savior and only Redeemer of the world." Thesis 172: "It is God's immutable will that all should believe in the Gospel, and that those who believe shall be saved," Mark 16. Th. 173: "As it is likewise His immutable will, that those who do not believe shall be damned." Th. 174: "Nor does the universality of the promises of the Gospel contradict the particularity of election" (i. e. by the fact, that election is restricted to a few, or that only a few are chosen). Thesis 175: "For God has not promised salvation to all promiscuously, but only to those who believe." Thesis 176: "Hence the particular election is included in the universal promise."* Moreover in this disputa-

* Well, well, Andreæ, what are you teaching here? Are you, the actual author of the F. C., still really in such lamentable ignorance regarding the very first letter of the pure doctrine of predestination, which

tion of 1574 Andreæ opposes an unconditional election in the following words: "Whoever seeks predestination in an absolute decree of God, because God's foreknowledge is absolutely certain, leads men to think that such a decree necessarily brings about the salvation of certain persons who under no circumstances can be condemned, while it likewise effects the damnation of others so that they cannot be saved. The result of this is that believers, becoming perplexed when considering this divine foreknowledge, cannot be cheered by consolation; men of Epicurean mind, however, thereby open for themselves and others the door for transgression; because the hidden will of God has decided everything, all our efforts avail nothing. . . . The reason why all are not saved is this, that they spurn the divine grace, which God offers to all in Christ. The fact, that this grace cannot be accepted by our own reason or strength, does not overthrow our proposition. All indeed are to hear, and by hearing are to come to faith. Whoever despises preaching, must accuse himself, and not a hidden decree of God, just as his conscience accuses only himself. The doctrine of an absolute decree also renders the work of the Word and the Sacrament useless. Reprobation by an absolute will, without the foresight of unbelief, is blasphemous. Whoever hears the Word, which he indeed cannot believe by his own powers, to him the Holy Spirit is promised, and He works that all who hear may also believe. This coming to hear preach-

---

consists of the very opposite of what you teach in these propositions? Don't you know that predestination and the universal gracious will of God are two entirely different "sides" of God's will, which neither reason nor the light of grace is able to harmonize with each other? Let me tell you, my dear Andreæ, you should have remained at home with your wisdom, which betrays a "rationalizing tendency"; you had better remain silent as long as you have no clearer light on the a b c of the pure doctrine of predestination. See, "it is impossible for us to mediate between, or to harmonize with our reason, these two scriptural doctrines concerning particular election and concerning universal grace. Not even the light of grace is able to remove this discord, we must wait for the light of glory" ("L. u. W.", 1880, 308). How then could you write such nonsense as this: "The universality of the promises does not contradict the particularity of election; for God has not promised salvation to all promiscuously, but only to those who believe; hence the particular election is included in the universal promise." Why, the thing is just the reverse! Election is "an altogether different thing" from this universal promise. And therefore the particularity of election contradicts the universality of the promise, and we cannot solve the contradiction, and you dare not,

ing, this willing and hearing, God demands as a piece of outward obedience, a leading, as it were by the hand, unto Christ, although in itself it does not effect conversion. But this man can do, hear the Word which is the organ of the Spirit, or stop his ears; but man has not the least measure of power for assent, as Erasmus claimed, assent is altogether the work of the Holy Spirit."

VI.

Twelve years later and six years after the adoption of the Formula of Concord, Jacob Andreæ issued what was probably his last discourse or treatise on the doctrine of predestination. In this are found the following theses: 5. "The Word of God teaches us concerning God as far as He is revealed to us, that He has formed no absolute decree concerning the human race, either with reference to salvation or to condemnation; but that in Christ Jesus are chosen as many as believe in Him, and that as many as do not believe are rejected." 18. "That, however, the call is said to be universal, while election is particular, is because the decree of God with reference to those who are to be saved is not absolute (unconditional), but has its restrictions." 19. "For since we are elected in Christ, this expression 'in Christ' is taken to embrace all the instruments and means necessary to come to a knowledge of Him, which by synecdoche we comprehend in the term faith." 20. "It must therefore be said, according to the revealed Word, and according to God as revealed therein, that

---

as you venture to do, harmonize the two by referring to passages like these: "He that believeth shall be saved," or : "Without faith it is impossible to please God." I am very much afraid, my dear Andreæ, that you agree with the later dogmaticians who make "election depend on faith", although I know, of course, that you are the chief author of the F. C., and that you ought to know how it is to be understood. Certainly we respect your Lutheranism otherwise; but when you include the particularity of election in the universal promise ("He that believeth shall be saved"), understanding the former by the latter, when thus you attempt "to explain somewhat and make plausible to our reason" (! !) "this wonderful mystery of election" by mixing in foreseen faith, then, we are sorry to say, you too have "forsaken the Scriptures and the Symbol" and gone off on the wrong track of Pelagianism. Still one thing serves to excuse you somewhat: your co-workers on the Formula, as the extracts from Selnecker and Chytræus show, were likewise not quite straight on this subject, and, to put it as mildly as possible, badly misunderstood their dear F. C. in this a b c point of the pure doctrine of election! Sapienti sat. [Note from the I. F. proper. — Translator.]

the selection of persons has taken place in this manner, that whosoever will believe in Christ and receive Him as his own Savior, shall not doubt that he has assuredly been foreordained and elected unto eternal life." 21. "On the other hand, whoever will not believe, but persists in neglecting and stubbornly despising the preaching of the Gospel, is to know of a surety that he is in no way foreordained or elected to eternal life; and this according to the words of Christ: 'Whosoever will not believe shall be damned.'" 31. "Just as election presupposes the merit of Christ and a knowledge of Him by true faith, so the decree of condemnation presupposes unbelief and rejection of Christ."* 90. "The unalterable and eternal truth therefore remains: As those who through faith are justified and saved have been elected in Christ to eternal life, so no one has been created, ordained, or destined to eternal damnation by a secret and absolute decree of God; the damned perish eternally because of their unbelief."

VII.

In the year 1586 the Colloqium at Moempelgart took place. The main debator on the Reformed side was Theodore Beza, on the Lutheran Jacob Andreæ. Among the sentences which Andreæ and L. Osiander, over their own signatures, rejected as "entirely contrary to the Word of God," we find the following: "The cause of the decree of election is the eternal loving kindness of God, inasmuch as He foreordained to salvation whom He wished; the cause of the decree of reprobation is God's eternal hatred of evil, inasmuch as He ordained to just condemnation whom He wished; the reason for His ordaining these to salvation and those to condemnation is merely His own will." Among the sentences given by Andreæ as remarks against Beza's theses, some very important expressions occur. For ex-

* "Sicut electio praesupponit Christi meritum et ejusdem agnitionem per veram fidem, sic condemnationis decretum praesupponit incredulitatem et contemptum Christi." — Andreæ, the principal author of the F. C. tells us: "Election presupposes the merit of Christ and a knowledge of Him by true faith," i. e. foreseen faith is presupposed in the act of election. Missouri tells us: "The Scriptures do not furnish the slighest ground for the assumption that foreseen faith was presupposed in the divine act of election." And surely Missouri understands the Scriptures and the Symbol better than the author of the Formula of Concord! [Note from the I. F. proper. — Tr.]

ample, Beza had written that "it is not only very silly, but even blasphemous, to think that, if God wishes to save every single individual, He should not be able to accomplish what He wishes; to think that the effect of the divine will depends on the decision of man." Andreæ answered: "God does not desire according to His absolute will that all men should be saved, for in that case all men would necessarily be saved, for who can resist His will? But He wishes it according to a restricted will in Christ, outside of whom He saves no one. Him (Christ) He offers to all men through the preaching of the Gospel and the use of the Sacraments. He who resists is lost, not through God's will, but through his own wickedness, contrary to the will of God." Touching the expression of Beza, that "the grace of conversion belongs exclusively to the elect," Andreæ remarks: "Election is not limited by an absolute decree, its limit is in Christ who calls all men to repentance. Therefore, no one should exclude himself from the number of the elect, but we should say with Augustine: 'If you have not been foreordained, do your part that you may be foreordained (Si non es praedestinatus, fac ut praedestineris).'" Beza maintained this proposition: "It is just as false to say that unbelief is a cause of the divine decree to condemn some justly, as it is false to say that foreseen faith or good works are a cause of the foreordination of the elect, which is Pelagian doctrine." Andreæ answered: "It is terrible to hear Beza daring to deny that unbelief is the cause of the divine decree condemning certain persons. Christ expressly declares: 'Whosoever does not believe is condemned already.' Furthermore: 'The Holy Spirit will judge the world on account of sin, because they did not believe in me.' Furthermore: 'Whosoever does not believe shall be damned.' . . . Faith in Christ is not the work of nature, or of human abilities, but a work of the Holy Spirit. Hence when we say that faith is a cause of election, there is nothing of the doctrine of the Pelagians in the assertion; they ascribe to man's natural powers what is the work of the Holy Spirit alone."*

---

* "Fides in Christum non est naturae, aut nostrarum humanarum virium, sed Spiritus Sancti opus. Cum ergo fides causa Electionis esse dicitur, nequaquam Pelagianorum dogma sapit, qui naturae viribus tribuerunt, quod solus Spiritus Sanctus praestare potest." The old German translation has the sentence as follows: "Darum wann wir" (Lutherans) "lehren, dass der Glaube an Christum die Ursache der ewigen Wahl Got-

VIII.

Christopher Koerner writes in his Commentary on Romans, 8, 29: "The first step in God's acts for the glorification of His children is the foreknowledge of God; for He has foreknown from eternity and perceived accurately those who were to be saved.* The second step is predestination, since God has for Himself foreordained, determined, and decided to whom He would grant salvation, and has electel only these out of the whole human race. The third step is the calling, as Paul says: "Whom He hath called." For in their time the elect are called through the Word and Sacraments, and invited to obtain the blessings in store for them. The fourth step is justification, for whom He hath called He also justifies. These, if they believe in His Son, He receives in mercy, having forgiven their sins for the sake of the Mediator. Finally the fifth step follows, which is glorification."

IX.

Martin Chemnitz, to whom our opponents appeal as one of the main supports of their strange doctrine of predestination, repeatedly draws attention to the fact, that the gracious decree of election has essentially the same import as the counsel of salvation and all that belongs to this counsel and flows from it and depends on it. Our opponents tear asunder the counsel of salvation as something universal, and the decree of election as a decree of salvation referring merely to the elect, to the exclusion

---

tes zur Kindschaft sei, ist es keineswegs der pelagianischen Ketzerei verwandt," etc. Thus one of the co-authors of the F. C. could express himself as a representative of Lutheran doctrine — six years after the adoption of the F. C.! — and the report of these discussions was circulated far and wide (in Latin and in German), and no man was found to accuse them of heterodoxy! !

* "Primus Gradus actionum Dei ad glorificandum suos, est Praescientia Dei: is enim ab aeternos praescivit et cognitus habuit, qui essent salvandi." As God's "determining to whom He would grant salvation" is, according to Koerner, the second step, this decree regarding those who are to be saved cannot be contained already in the first step, otherwise the two would contain one and the same thing. Moreover, Koerner distinguishes plainly between God's foreknowledge and God's decree, making the latter follow the former. First comes foreknowledge, then foreordination respecting those to be saved.

of the others. Chemnitz, however, wherever he touches this topic, sees in the plan of salvation at the same time also the plan of election as its real crown and summit. Chemnitz knows nothing of two distinct plans running parallel to each other while contradicting one another. When, therefore, he discusses this main topic, that God, in mercy alone, and without being moved by "any cause in us," formed His gracious counsel for our salvation, he refers this to the entire plan of salvation as it extends over all the lost and condemned race of mankind. In this way, however, the rejection of any "cause in us," in the matter of our election, vocation, justification, and salvation, gets to have an entirely different meaning from that which our opponents find in it. For they maintain that we dare not conceive the bestowal of eternal life, which takes place for certain sinners through their election, as dependent on the foreseen apprehension of Christ's merit by faith, since in Him alone the lost sinner can obtain from God forgiveness of all his sins and thereby also life and salvation. The choice of certain persons is represented indeed as being in essence the bestowal of eternal life; but foreseen faith, taken strictly as the apprehension of Christ's merits, is said not to have been a prerequisite of this bestowal, but only a fruit and result of it. This is even claimed to have been the meaning of the fathers when they rejected every "cause in us." Compare with this the following telling testimony of Martin Chemnitz, taken from his exposition of the passage: "God so loved the world:"—

"It is here explained how and why the incarnate Son of God took upon Himself our deliverance. In the secret counsel of the Triune God the decree of redemption was formed, in inexpressible mercy, to save us without any merit whatever on our part, by the free grace and love and mercy of God; hence we are to be assured that election, justification, and the bestowal of salvation through faith is valid before God for the sake of Christ. And we will show briefly how each single word must be weighed. By using a word designating past time: (God) 'so loved the world,' He leads us to consider what is set forth more completely in Eph. 1, 4-5; 2 Tim. 1, 9. Here we read that God, before the foundation of the world, and before the time of the world, out of grace, according to the purpose and good pleasure of His will, foreordained and determined to redeem us through the blood of Christ, to receive us unto sonship, and to make us pleasing to Himself

unto everlasting life.* For the Son of God did not hit upon the thought of salvation in a sudden impulse or without deeper consideration; it was decided in the secret counsel of the Triune God before the time of the world. Therefore all these things are fixed and legally established. And, of course, at that time, before the beginning of the world, when we were not yet in existence, there could be no reference to any merit of the world. And in order that no one may think that God possibly foresaw something in us, or that there is in us any cause on account of which God should deem us worthy of consideration and of freeing us, Christ places God and the world in opposition to each other, i. e. God and sin-corrupted man. For God is the highest good, sufficient unto Himself, requiring no one, beholden to none, and having many thousands of angels to do His bidding. Man, however, is dust and earth, like a withered flower, like vanishing vapor. What then is man, the miserable creature, that He is mindful of him, and the son of man that He should visit him? Ps. 8, 4. Yea, the whole world lies in wickedness, 1 John 5, 19. The carnal mind is at enmity against God, Rom. 8, 7. And God is a jealous God who does not wish sin, but punishes and condemns it. Now that God, being such as He is, should not reject and condemn the world utterly, but without any merit on its part, against all it had deserved, should love it, is an immensurable, incomprehensible, and unutterable mercy. As Paul says, Rom. 5, 8: 'God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us; for scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die.' But we must not think that God loves or sanctions sin itself, or that He is unconcerned whether men resist or obey, or that men are pleasing or acceptable to Him when they remain in their vices. For this militates openly against the whole doctrine of the Law, of which not one jot or tittle will pass away or fall to the ground without being fulfilled, Matt. 5, 18; Rom. 3, 31. But the word 'love' includes mercy, as is set forth in Eph. 2, 4; i. e. God foresaw the lamentable corruption and deplorable destruction of the whole human race; and in His immensurable mercy

* To understand the doctrine of Chemnitz aright, it is important to note that he takes passages like Eph. 1, 4, and 2 Tim. 1, 9, as referring to the universal counsel of salvation. Compare below where in the same way he finds "the counsel concerning the redemption of the human race through Christ" in Eph. 1, 4; 2 Tim. 1, 9; Titus 1, 2.

and pity He grieved deeply that the whole human race must so miserably perish forever; and thus, moved by mercy and compassion, He formed the thought and determination to redeem and free the human race; and this, although He had passed by the fallen nature of the angels, notwithstanding they were far more excellent than we, and left them in their deserved condemnation. For this consideration also glorifies God's love toward us. But in order that no contradictory or conflicting wills may be attributed to God, the thought must always be held fast, that this decree of redemption was formed on the basis of Christ's mediation, who offered Himself as a propitiation. For the love and mercy of God toward us sinners rests on Christ as the Mediator." (Harm. Ev., p. 243.)

X.

It is altogether unscriptural to conclude: "God has from eternity out of grace, on account of the merits of Christ alone, granted eternal life to the elect; therefore, in this granting of salvation faith in Christ has not come into consideration." This is evinced by the fact, that God's eternal decree, as revealed to us in the Gospel, is precisely this: "That whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." In his explanation of these words Chemnitz, therefore, proves clearly that salvation, according to God's eternal decree, is inded entirely a gift of grace, that nevertheless it is in complete harmony with this doctrine to teach that, in the eternal counsel of God, the rule, "whosoever believes shall be saved," formed a link in the chain of decrees constituting predestination. And the Formula of Concord likewise mentions this expressly as one of the eternal decrees in predestination, that God receives as sons and heirs of eternal life those who receive Christ in faith, but outside of those who receive Christ He would save none.

Chemnitz explains the words: "That whosoever believeth in Him," etc., as follows: "This Christ acquired for us by His merit, that in the judgment of God we do not become subject to the destruction of eternal damnation on account of our sins in accordance with the sentence of the Law, but that we, as believers, obtain eternal life for His sake. And hereby He shows us that as long as we are separated from Christ we are in the net of eternal condemnation, and have no part in eternal life. At the same time He shows us that faith is the regular means through which we

receive, apprehend, and appropriate the grace of God and the merit of Christ, and make it our own for our deliverance from destruction and unto eternal life. In the Law many impossible works are required. But these blessed gifts of Christ God offers us through the service of the Gospel in such manner that, by merely bringing faith along, which also the Holy Ghost works in us through the Word, we become partakers and joint possessors of the merits of Christ. Thus our salvation is entirely a gift of God, and depends on Him alone. And that He may invite the whole world to partake of Christ's merits, and cut off every excuse of unbelievers, He says: 'That whosoever believeth in Him.' These words are also full of consolation for us in our unworthiness; they say to us: No matter what kind of a sinner you are, what your station in life, or your age may be, if only you truly believe in Christ, you will be saved. For whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life. But that true faith must have true repentance, and must afterwards be active in love, is shown elsewhere. Here we purpose to explain only what Christ says; i. e. it is not demanded that we by our own works make ourselves worthy or acceptable for participating in Christ's merits, or that we add something of our patchwork; on the contrary, we are to receive by faith, as it were with a beggar's hand, the all-sufficient satisfaction of Christ and His perfect righteousness, offered to us in the Gospel; and this, that the promise may stand sure, Rom. 4, 16. And from this the conclusion is drawn as to how and why faith justifies, regenerates, and saves; it does this not because of its own virtue or character, but because it embraces Christ and the merits of His obedience and suffering, as offered to us in the promise of the Gospel, and places Him between our sins and the wrath and judgment of God. And it is certain that God will receive such faith, because He Himself gave His Son into death for us, and now offers Him to us through the Spirit in the Word as our salvation, so that whosoever believeth shall not perish, but have everlasting life. This also shows us why faith must be a sure confidence of the heart. For he who doubts that Christ's merit is sufficient for his salvation, reviles the bitter death of Christ. But he who doubts whether the Father will receive those in mercy who believe, denies the very decree which was formed in the common council of the Trinity: 'That whosoever believeth shall not perish, but have everlasting life.' Therefore, those who have been reconciled to

God through faith are not to doubt that God earnestly loves them, since He loved us so exceedingly while we were yet His enemies, Rom. 5, 10, and since He has given the dearest pledge of His love, His only begotten Son." (Harm. Ev., p. 244.)

XI.

"The Father gives us everything necessary to eternal life, but by the hand of the Son. Since we are not worthy to receive these things, the incarnate Son has been established as Mediator, and He merits all and is worthy. . . . The Father hath given over all things to Him, that He may preserve our portion until that day, 2 Tim. 4, 8. Even when man's nature was yet perfect, it could not preserve the blessings it possessed; how should it be able to preserve them now? So the Father has entrusted our portion to a safe and reliable guardian, placing it into the hand of His Son; only we must keep faith, as Paul says, 2 Tim. 4, 7." (Harm. Ev., p. 258.)

XII.

Did Chemnitz really teach an election in view of divine foreknowledge? That would discredit him in the eyes of our opponents. And yet we cannot judge otherwise when we carefully weigh his words concerning the election of Judas Iscariot to the apostleship (Harm. Ev., p. 403). He there asks the question, whether God indeed erred in His judgment, when this traitor was chosen to be an apostle. That He did not err is shown already in John 6, 64, where we are told that Jesus knew even from the beginning who was unbelieving and who would betray Him. God certainly had His reasons why Judas, who according to God's foreknowledge would betray the Savior, nevertheless was received into the original number of the apostles. It is of especial importance here to distinguish between election and election, between the election unto the apostleship and the election unto salvation. "The Scriptures," says Chemnitz, "maintain both: that Judas was elected by Christ, and that he was not. John 6, 70, we read: 'Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil!' But John 13, 18: 'I speak not of you all; for I know whom I have chosen.' Jesus then knew that Judas would be a traitor. But He did not order the election of apostles according to this divine foreknowledge; in this He followed the signs and

indications of which men are able to judge.* For without doubt, according to outward appearance Judas was diligent, zealous, well-informed, and of good behavior."

Chemnitz distinguishes between the election to the apostleship and the election to salvation, by saying the former did not take place "according to this divine foreknowledge, and so Judas could indeed be chosen as an apostle, although Jesus knew that he would become the traitor. Chemnitz, however, does not proceed to show that election to salvation does take place "according to this divine foreknowledge," and that therefore the Savior could also say, Judas is not among the number of the elect, i.e. of those elected to obtain salvation. But the distinction made by Chemnitz in regard to two kinds of election, even adding the distinguishing mark of the one kind as "not according to this divine foreknowledge," would be entirely without sense or purpose, if he had not conceived of the other election, that unto salvation, as having indeed taken place "according to this divine foreknowledge," so that Judas could not in this sense be among the elect. If Chemnitz had entertained the idle notion, that neither the election to the apostleship, nor the election to salvation took place "according to this divine foreknowledge," he could not possibly have given as the distinguishing mark of the one, the fact of its not taking place according to the divine foreknowledge; nor could he possibly have given this as the reason and explanation, why Judas could indeed be chosen in one sense, and yet not in the other. Chemnitz evidently means to say: A man like Judas could indeed be chosen to the apostleship, because this election is not governed by the divine foreknowledge as to what Judas' end would be; but to salvation he was not, and could not be, elected, because this election is governel by "this divine foreknowledge."

What Chemnitz does not enlarge upon yet plainly implies as his meaning, John Gerhard expressed fully in his continuation of the Harmony (II, p. 1067). He writes: "When Christ says: 'I know whom I have chosen,' His meaning is: I do not only know now what your mind is toward me, but I knew and saw it already in eternity; and this is why, when I together with

* Electionem autem Apostolorum instituit non juxta divinam illam praescientiam, sed juxta illa signa et testimonia, de quibus homo judicare potest.

the Father and the Holy Spirit formed the eternal decree of election, I did not choose you all, but only those of whom I foresaw that they would perseveringly believe in me, Rom. 8, 29. Although I have chosen you all to the apostleship, also the traitor, yet I have not chosen you all to eternal salvation; but I know whom I have chosen, namely you others who hear my voice, John 10, 17, you who believe in me, 1 Tim. 1, 16, you who do not willingly and wilfully commit crimes, as a certain one among you has done, but receive my admonitions with faithful and obedient hearts."

XIII.

A further testimony to the effect that Chemnitz did not think the secret foreordination of God dependent upon His mere unconditional will, but conceived of it as being closely connected with the divine foresight of all things, we find in his explanation of the words: "Your heavenly Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask Him" (Matt. 6, 8). "For God knows before we ask not only what we have need of, but also what He wills to do and will do, and yet His foreordination is not independent of our asking. On the contrary, this secret divine foreordination is governed, through the intervening foreknowledge of all things, by the question whether prayer, which He has commanded us as an order of His will, is uttered in time, or is neglected. His omniscient foreordination follows the revealed order, and takes into consideration in how far the commands of the divine ordering: 'Ask and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you,' have been complied with. For he that asketh shall receive; and he that seeketh shall find; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. Even in God's secret foreordination the petition that is uttered in time is taken as a prerequisite or condition on which the obtaining of the blessing as an answer to prayer is dependent. In the same way God's omniscient foreordination is governed by the word: 'Ye have not because ye ask not.' He who reasons: 'God has foreordained everything He will do and give; of what use is prayer? if He is not willing, according to His secret foreordination, that I should be released from sin or die in saving faith, then all my prayers and pleadings are in vain" — he who reasons thus would, as Luther says, entertain 'foolish, devilish thoughts.' For all that God has predetermined or not

predetermined in His secret counsel depends, by virtue of His omniscience and divine foreknowledge, altogether upon the order He has fixed and made known to us, to which we should submit, and according to which He intends to deal with us. We can therefore truthfully say: If God had found more people ready to submit to His order, He would have foreordained more unto salvation; for even in eternity man's foreordination was dependent on whether he would submit to the divine order or not. As Luther says: 'Few are chosen, that is, few so deport themselves toward the Gospel that God has pleasure in them.' And again: 'Let every man sweep before his own door, then we all will be saved'" (evidently meaning: then we all are foreordained to salvation even before the foundation of the world); "'then it will not require much brooding on what God has determined in His counsel, as to who shall and who shall not be saved'" (for this secret counsel is governed by the omniscient foreknowledge of God as to how those called will deport themselves toward the Gospel, whether they will "sweep before their own doors" according to God's will, i. e. repent and believe, hear God's Word diligently, pray, etc., — all this through the grace offered them).—

Hear now how Chemnitz speaks of God's secret foreordination and its relation to the revealed order. He writes: "There are some who contend, or at least trouble themselves with the thought: Since God, without our asking and before our asking, already knows, and has even foreordained and fixed, what He will do or give, our asking will be a useless thing, requesting something that will come at any rate, or it will be a godless thing, hoping to turn God from His fixed decree and purpose, and attempting thus to render Him unstable and changeable. Some reply to this objection as follows: If what I pray for is predestined to take place, I can certainly pray with all confidence; if not, no attempt is made to hinder or disturb the course of divine foreordination, because we pray: Thy will be done. But Luther's explanation is simpler and safer. He tells us: We are not commanded to trouble ourselves at all about this hidden foreknowledge (arcana præscientia) of God, nor to pry into His secret counsels and decrees; but we are commanded to govern ourselves according to His will as revealed in the Word, and here He teaches us that by repentance and prayer God's anger is appeased, many dangers and evils are warded off, and many

blessings are obtained. Jer. 18, 8; Ezek. 33, 11; 1 Kings 8, 56. And therefore He earnestly commands us to pray; yea, He is greatly displeased, when he finds none ready to build himself a wall and stand in the breach against Him (by prayer) to prevent His destroying the land, Ezek. 22, 30. Christ thus bids us remember (by this word: Your Father knoweth, etc.): in the first place, that God is entirely willing to help us, and that He knows what we lack, and what He will do; in the second place, that it is none the less God's will and command that we should pray. Furthermore, we are to make and admit no deductions from His hidden foreknowledge* contrary to the revelations and commands contained in His Word. If, however, you are unable to harmonize these things, leave it to God to figure out His secret foreknowledge, and do on your part what His Word commands and prescribes for you, namely that you shall pray, and this without ceasing." — Note well how Chemnitz here puts God's foreknowledge in the foreground, and not the mere foreordination of an unconditional, absolute purpose.

XIV.

The assertion and the denial, that the older Lutheran teachers did not call the entire decree concerning the salvation of sinners at the same time also the counsel of predestination or election, perhaps more than anything else at present, creates confusion and error in judging their presentation of the doctrine of election. He who overlooks this, or intentionally disregards it, necessarily misunderstands these older teachers completely. He who takes the universal counsel of salvation, of which election unto the infallible attainment of salvation is merely an essential part; he who goes on and places by the side of this universal counsel a particular and independent decree of "saving" election which from the very start applies only to the sinners therein chosen; he who then proceeds and transfers to this particular and inde-

* As for instance the terrible deduction of modern Missouri, which is offered as a part of the "Gospel": "If I do not belong to the elect" (i. e. to those predestinated according to the free purpose and mere will of God), "then I may pray ever so diligently (!), hear God's Word, receive absolution, partake of the Lord's Supper, it is all in vain (i. e. the non-elect may "sweep before their own doors" ever so diligently, they simply cannot and shall not be saved!).

pendent decree what our older dogmaticians say of the counsel of election as they understood it — why, he, most assuredly, will dish up a lot of exceedingly curious statements. This mistake constitutes a "proton pseudos" (fundamental error), and has caused terrible harm. And yet our old writers have treated this subject so often and thoroughly, that he who is at all acquainted with their statements cannot possibly remain in error, unless he wishes to err intentionally, i. e. to hold fast his preconceived false notions in spite of the clear truth. Of course, we do not here refer to that choir of parrots who, to use the words of President Schwan, "merely repeat what they have been told before," and thus manage to produce a "wonderful" unity of the spirit. Consider, for instance, how often Chemnitz resolves the counsel of "predestination or election" into its component parts. What is the outcome in every instance? Why, precisely what we term the universal plan of salvation. He explicitly and most emphatically demands that we treat all the different parts of the order of salvation (as we generally term it) as constituent parts of the counsel of election or of the decree of predestination; and this not only in so far — as Missounri indefatigably asserts, especially in regard to the eight points in the F. C. — as this order refers also to the elect, but in so far as this counsel of election constitutes for all men in the same way the one and only counsel of salvation, which God formed in eternity and revealed in His Word. Concerning the universal order of salvation, as constituting in all its parts for all men the only valid order for obtaining salvation, Chemnitz has the following to say: "This is the simple meaning and purport of what belongs to the foresight of God, what it embraces, and wherein it consists." "Prædestinatio embraces the whole plan of redemption, vocation, justification, and glorification." So then the universal plan of salvation is also the counsel of predestination. God did not form two essentially different counsels of salvations, one conditional for the salvation of all men, if they repent and believe, the other unconditional for the salvation only of the elect, as a result of which only these actually shall and must come to repentance and persevering faith. The former as the revealed counsel of God having a so-called "universal" and a "certain sufficient" grace (actually, however, very insufficient); the latter, however, having a grace which "guarantees" all its operations, which infallibly "attains its end,"

which, to come right out with it, is an irresistible grace, existing in the secret counsel and purpose of God only for the elect, and bringing these unconditionally and infallibly unto salvation. For, says modern Missouri, how could one of the elect prevent God by his wilful resistance from converting and saving him? He cannot prevent Him! The grace which exists for him as a result of his election, operating as a "cause," must prevail, he must be converted and saved, as the snow must melt under the vivifying rays of the sun in spring! Two kinds of counsels with two kinds of grace constitute the "adorable mystery" of the new doctrine of election. But of all this Chemnitz knows absolutely nothing. For him the act of election is the division, determined on in eternity and clearly revealed in the Gospel, regarding the bestowal of salvation and of damnation, the separation which God instituted between sinners and sinners, predestinating as heirs of salvation all those who believe in Christ, and excluding from the inheritance all those who do not believe. For without payment God grants heaven to no sinner. The payment that must be made is Christ's merit and righteousness. And this payment can be considered as having been personally rendered by the sinner himself only through faith. There is not one living word in all the Gospel of Christ, as its glad tidings are to be proclaimed to all creatures, concerning any further particular counsel of God, as to which sinners only He really means to assist by a "guaranteeing, prevailing" (i. e. irresistible) grace in the rendering of this payment through believing acceptance of Christ's merit. The Gospel knows only of one counsel, and this is at once the universal counsel of grace and the counsel of election, which declares to us: "God so loved the world — that whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish." And so "election in Christ" is proclaimed to all men and offered to all in the Gospel, that they may "seek it there and be able to find it."

But let us hear now how Chemnitz sets forth his doctrine concerning the real essence of the counsel of predestination. "The doctrine of predestination," he writes in his Examen, p. 152, "shows us the decrees which God formed and afterwards revealed in the Word, concerning the causes and the manner of saving and of condemning. There is 1) the decree of God concerning the redemption of the human race through the obedience and suffering of the Mediator Christ. 2) The decree of vocation

through the office of the Word, inviting Jews as well as Gentiles unto participation in the merit of Christ for their salvation. 3) The decree of God, that by means of the hearing of the Word He will work through His Spirit in the hearts of men, that they may repent and believe the Gospel. 4) The decree of God, that when men feel their sins and the wrath of God, flee by faith to the throne of grace, and accept the Mediator Christ presented in the promise of the Gospel, He will justify and save them, but will damn those who reject the Word, despise and refuse to accept the promise. This is the sum and explanation of the doctrine of predestination, as it is revealed in the Word."

According to Chemnitz these four decrees contain a brief summary or epitome of the doctrine of election "as it is revealed in the Word." The universal counsel of salvation is at the same time the counsel of predestination, inasmuch as the selection of those who alone are to receive salvation is merely the realization of the decree contained in the universal counsel of salvation, i. e. that God will save none except those who acknowledge Christ by faith, as also the Epitome, § 13, declares. Election, therefore, understood as the external fixed decree regarding the bestowal of salvation upon certain sinners as distinguished from all others, presupposes in these elect, through divine foresight, the knowledge of Christ, to which eternal life is joined, John 17, 3. So at least God's will and decree concerning salvation has been revealed to us; not vice versa, that first of all God in His will determined which sinners from among all sinners He would surely bring to salvation, and that faith then is regarded merely as a means in the decree for carrying it into effect, and must be placed after the actual selection of persons as a result or effect of this selection. But what a strange supposition, to imagine that Chemnitz wants to give us in these four decrees "a sum or analysis" of the revealed doctrine of predestination, and then fails to touch even with a word the very chief thing, according to Missouri's view, the real kernel and essence of election! He talks at great length about an "altogether different thing" in these four decrees, and never breathes a single word about the real "predestination" as our Calvinizing Lutherans would have us understand it! Not the slightest trace of "predestination" is to be found in these four decrees as our modern Missourians have been learned from the Dort fathers to define it (see

"Altes and Neues," Vol. 1, p. 92). And still we are told that even Chemnitz understood "predestination" as something differing from, yea, contrary to, the entire counsel of salvation. He supposed, we are told, that "predestination" is the especial merciful decree concerning sinners as such from among sinners; the decree taking some "certain persons" from among them, without reference to future faith as a condition or prerequisite of "saving election," and foreordaining them unto salvation, and thereby also unto faith, or, if you prefer, unto "salvation through faith." Poor Chemnitz! Expressing yourself so unintelligibly; evidently confusing the universal counsel of salvation with the counsel of predestination! You should have known that this is "an altogether different thing." But why did you live in such unenlightened times!

XV.

In his sermon on Matthew 22 Chemnitz further explains how it comes that only so few are chosen while so many are called. He writes: "In this parable the Lord shows item by item what all belongs to this article, and how one part always follows and flows from the other. Predestination or divine election consists in and embraces the following: Since God foresaw that the human race would fall away from Him through sin, and thereby sink under God's wrath and the devil's power into eternal destruction and damnation, He considered, deliberated, and determined in His secret counsel, before the foundations of the world were laid, how the human race might be delivered from its destruction and be brought again to salvation. He thus determined:

1) That His own Son should take upon Himself our human nature; that is, as the parable states, the King prepared a wedding feast for His Son, and desired Him to espouse or wed our human nature.

2) That He should be put under the Law, and be slain as a sacrifice for our sins; that thus through Him everything necessary for the wedding joys of eternal salvation might be prepared.

3) That, beside the flesh and blood which His dear Son would assume in the unity of His person, He would have still other guests for His salvation, not from among the fallen angels, but from among the human race, which is now, through the

assumed human nature of the Son, related and allied to Him as His bride, flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone.

4) That He would call these guests of His through His servants to the marriage feast; that is, reveal His heavenly counsel to the world through the Word, and call mankind to His kingdom through the spoken word.

5) That He would be efficacious through this call, and would work in the hearts of men, enlighten, convert, and justify them.

6) That He would protect, guard, preserve, eternally save, and glorify those whom He had thus justified. As St. Paul links all these members together, making a golden chain, in the beautiful passage, Rom. 8: For whom He did foreknow, or predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.

7) Because God foresaw that the wickedness of human nature would not follow this call and operation of God, but would resist and would not receive the grace of God, when desiring to work in man, He determined in His purpose that all those who despise, blaspheme, and persecute His call, or refuse to follow it when His grace desires to work in them, and persist in such resistance, shall be punished in time, and rejected and damned in eternity, as the parable clearly shows.

This is the simple meaning and purport of what belongs to the foresight of God, what it embraces, and wherein it consists; all these parts we must take together when we speak or think of God's predestination or election, as Paul treats this doctrine and explains it part by part in the entire first chapter of his letter to the Ephesians. And when I follow this report and abide in simplicity, I have all that I need to know of this doctrine, together with the assurance that I cannot err or go wrong."

Manifestly, Chemnitz here again forgot, according to Missouri's notion, the very chief thing, and allowed himself to speak about "an altogether different thing." With not a single word does he say that election consists of this, that God, according to His mere will, selected from among those equally lost some whom He would bring to faith and preserve therein. Further on we even read in his sermon: "Now it is indeed true that no man is saved unless he receive the Word; and it is right too that no man should be able to receive the proffered grace of God by his own powers. For he who teaches that the natural free

will of unregenerate man has the power and ability to receive the grace of God, contradicts the entire Word of God. 1 Cor. 2; 2 Cor. 3; Rom. 3. But we must conclude from the Scriptures that, when God presents His Word to us, it is His will to work in us through His Word, so that by His gift, power, and work we may be enabled to receive the proffered grace. Yet the natural wickedness of the flesh can indeed resist this operation of God, and God knows all those beforehand who will thus resist. But I am not bidden to search this out; on the contrary, I reason and judge according to God's Word that when He calls me by the Word He will work in me the power necessary that I may receive it." — And here again, if Missouri is correct, poor Chemnitz forgets the main thing.

He should have explained the fact, that some come to faith, and others not, by stating that, as regards this question, the "mustering" of persons, which are to be saved and which are not, had already taken place in advance as the first thing in the order of events; therefore, this antecedent election of individual persons unto salvation is the "cause" of their conversion and faith, and vice versa, faith "flows" from this election of individual persons as from a higher and primary source. Chemnitz, however, is satisfied to state, on the one hand, that God would produce the acceptance of grace and faith in all, on the other hand, however, that all the called are left with the ability of resisting, and that in some of them natural resistance becomes at last willful resistance. Concerning these he tells us: "God knows them all beforehand"; and not, as Missouri would have it: "He hardeneth whom He will," thus attributing to God the unconditional rejection of a part of mankind.

XVI.

When the Formula of Concord teaches that the "eternal election of God" — the election, not merely its execution, not merely the "ways and means" for that end — "has been revealed in the Gospel," it goes on and teaches likewise that this election, taking in exclusively only those who will be saved, pertains only to believers as such. The Gospel speaks about no other election or selection of sinners for salvation; there is no "revelation" about any other election. Therefore the Epitome describes the "revelation" of election in the following manner: "The true judgment

concerning predestination must be learned alone from the Holy Gospel concerning Christ, in which it is clearly testified that 'God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all,' and that 'He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance' and believe in the Lord Christ. . . . In Him, therefore, we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who, in His eternal divine counsel, determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him. . . . As He has promised this gracious election not only with mere words, but has also certified it with an oath, and sealed it with the Holy Sacraments." The Solid Declaration points out just as emphatically that election must be regarded as having taken place "in Christ, and not beyond or without Christ." For "in Christ we are chosen" (not beyond Christ). "Therefore the entire Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, direct all men to Christ, as to the Book of Life, in which they should seek the eternal election of the Father. For it has been decided by the Father from eternity that whom He would save He would save through Christ: 'No man cometh unto the Father but by me.' And again: 'I am the door; by me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved.' But Christ as the only begotten Son of God who is in the bosom of the Father (cf. John 1, 18) has published to us the will of the Father, and thus (hac ratione) also our election to eternal life, viz: when He says: 'Repent ye and believe the Gospel; the kingdom of God is at hand.' He also says: 'This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have everlasting life.' And again: 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' "

Now if the same serious reproach is not to fall also upon the Formula of Concord that, while using the word "election," it has been speaking about "an entirely different thing," then it must be conceded that it sets up as the rule of election, — "revealed and published in the Gospel," "promised with mere words, and certified with an oath, and sealed with the Sacraments" — or as the eternal decree of election this sentence: "All who repent and believe in Christ shall not perish, but have everlasting life." This point must be held fast as the very heart of

the Gospel, otherwise the doctrine of justification will be destroyed in its very foundation. Did God grant irrevocably to certain sinners eternal life — and this He did — then He granted it to them either as sinners without repentance and faith, as they are by nature, or as sinners who through His grace, as it is offered to all, have come to repentance and faith, i. e. from the decisive point of view of Christ's merit embraced by faith as the only payment for their sin. For "this very faith makes the difference between those who are saved and those who are damned, between the worthy and the unworthy. For eternal life has been promised to none save those who are reconciled in Christ" (Book of Concord, Ed. Mueller, p. 144). To teach a will of God which takes certain unbelieving sinners from among the whole unbelieving mass, and ultimately grants to them eternal life, is to overthrow the revealed doctrine of the Gospel in its very foundation. Then it is plain, not "the gracious good pleasure of God in Christ," which makes a difference between sinners according to their faith or their unbelief, but the absolute, immovable mere will of divine power "had compassion upon whom He would, and hardened whom He would." Indeed, a "horrible abyss"! — although on the one side a compassionate will for a few, yet, on the other, a will of rejection and hardening for equals among equals! How different the doctrine of the Formula of Concord! Election, inasmuch as it separates, divides, and selects, consists in this that the Father "determined to save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him." Election, therefore, is confined to those who, according to God's foresight, will be found in Christ — through faith; to those who acknowledge Christ and believe in Him. The essence of the decree of election is the will of God: I will grant salvation for the sake of Christ's merit only to those who believe in Him.

In addition to the extracts given above we cite a few passages from Selnecker on this all-important point. In the "Apology to the Book of Concord," which he published in company with Chemnitz and Kirchner, we read, p. 210: "Nor do we forget that all who truly repent are chosen, and that all such persons should confidently conclude that they are chosen and are children of God, in and through Christ in whom they believe. For he on whom God bestows eternal life through faith in His Son, John 3, must surely be chosen and be a child of God." (John 3, 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life.")

XVII.

How does Selnecker in his large Commentary of the year 1595 explain the words: "Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate"?—"Whom He did foreknow (praescivit, pro-egno): did foresee (praevidit) according to His immeasurable wisdom, viewed in advance (prospexit) from eternity and approved.—He also did predestinate: pro-orise, defined in advance (praefiniit), established, ordained. He determined and established them before the foundation of the world, and entered them in the album of His fatherly grace as having been taken out of the mass of mortals destined to eternal death, separated and chosen as God's colony. Eph. 1: He ordained us as persons whom He would adopt as children. If now we ask: Where, whence, and in what manner this foreordination is to be sought and obtained, Paul replies: In Christ! For God the Father predestinated them as being conformed to the image of His Son. Beyond Christ, and without Christ, and without being planted into Christ, and without faith in Him there is no foreordination and election unto salvation. The only Son of God, the only begotten Son of the Father, became man, the first-born among many brethren, in regard to cross and affliction as well as in regard to resurrection and glorification. . . . This shows that the godly can easily answer the question: What is foreordination? It is simply our fraternal relation to Christ, the Savior; or as the Syriac translation has it: The sealing wherewith God the Father sealed us in His incarnate Son, and ordained us to salvation according to an agreement made with the Son and the Holy Spirit, as we are told: He that believeth in the Son hath eternal life. Therefore Paul declares: 'Whom He did predestinate, them He also called,' i. e. through the office of the Gospel, that they might be converted to Christ." (Page 177.) "Every man who is called to the doctrine of the Gospel, who believes in Christ and submits himself to His Word, is foreordained and chosen of God unto eternal salvation. He that believes in the Son hath eternal life, i. e. is predestinated."

XVIII.

How does Selnecker explain the words: "Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth"?—He says: "A new objection is here (Rom. 9, 14-

18) raised: If we are saved by grace alone, why are not all saved, why are many lost and wholly rejected? Is God an unjust God, awarding to equals unequal judgment? Paul answers: God forbid that a godly man should entertain this thought and inference; and God be praised for the grace of which we are made partakers in Christ. It is enough to know that no work of ours, no merit, no human desire, zeal, or anything of the kind, aids us in the least in obtaining salvation, but only God's grace and fatherly mercy, which is granted to us who believe in Him, through Christ, and for the sake of the Son and Mediator, by the good pleasure and free will and goodness of God alone; as it is written: I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, i. e. with the tenderest compassion of a father's love. But this will of God, this mercy and compassion of love, became known openly in the Son of God. He that believeth in Him hath eternal life, out of God's pure mercy. By a correct inference from all this, and as an antithesis to it all, it is likewise certain that all who do not believe are judged and damned, and the wrath of God abideth upon them; and yet He doth not desire the death of a sinner, but that the wicked may turn from his way and live; He would have all men to be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth; He is long-suffering, and will have none to be lost, but all should return to repentance. As many then as are lost and damned are lost not through any fault of God, but by their own fault, according to God's just judgment; as it is written: 'Righteous art Thou, O Lord, and upright are Thy judgments.' 'O Lord, righteousness belongeth to Thee; but unto us confusion of face.' 'O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help.' Men, however, are now lost not because they are conceived and born in sin. For in this respect, since all men are alike, they are all without exception by nature children of wrath, and one and all deservedly under the judgment and eternal condemnation of God. They are lost because they reject and will not hear God who desires to have mercy upon them, to bring them back to the right way, to advise, assist, and offer them His fatherly hand. As far as original sin is concerned, God could reject all mankind; but now He is moved by His mercy and the mediatorial work of His Son, and proclaims that His paternal heart is reconciled toward the human race. He declares that He will not remember our sins, or go into judgment with us, if only we will look upon the seed of the woman, who

bruised the serpent's head, bringing us the blessing, if only we will embrace Him by faith and subject ourselves to His Word. This is medicine for our ills; this is deliverance from the wrath of God, from judgment and condemnation. This assurance is sealed by an eternal, invincible, and unmovable purpose of God. This is the book of life in which the names of the elect are written, namely Christ Himself, whom the Father has sealed, and us in Him, i. e. chosen us, receiving us unto sonship, and saving us; as it is written: 'As many as received Him to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name.' But as many as despise this decree of God, this mercy of God, and this book of life, i. e. Christ, these blessings and merits of Christ, and God's fatherhand, and His most gracious will, are completely and most justly rejected from God's countenance and eternally condemned. And this not merely on account of the guilt of original sin in which they were conceived and born, as by nature children of wrath and eternal pain; nor merely on account of their actual or moral sins, which all God would have forgiven them in His mercy and grace for the sake of Christ, if they had not refused to hear and receive God, the Physician and Savior, who Himself offered to save mankind. They are rejected and condemned because they despised the Savior to the end, refused and rejected the grace of God and the work of the Holy Spirit." (Page 190.)

XIX.

"From the revealed will of God, in the doctrine of the Gospel concerning Christ we conclude correctly in regard to foreordination: All who believe in the Son are foreordained, i. e. they have eternal life. This is the voice of the Gospel, which must constitute the starting point, in which we must rest tranquil and content, and to which we must cling fast till death, or till our final redemption. And when we are transferred from this world into the glory of the heavenly life, as it is written: 'I will that they also, whom Thou hast given me, be with me,' then we will discuss perfectly, completely, thoroughly, and without further searching the eternal and secret counsels of God and the whole order of causes, and attain eternal certainty. For the present it is sufficient that we firmly trust the revealed will of God in the Word and in the use of the Sacraments, for we know that it is

identical with the eternal, secret will which is hidden from the wise of this world."

Query: "Is then the doctrine of foreordination unto eternal life, and the doctrine of man's justification before God, one and the same doctrine?" Answer: "It is altogether the same. There is no cause of foreordination, which is not equally a cause of justification. It is for this reason that Paul establishes the doctrine of justification by grace through the doctrine of foreordination.* There is here no difference, except that foreordination refers to the eternal will and good pleasure of God, which was unknown to all creatures, whilst the doctrine of justification refers to the revelation of this eternal and hidden will, which has taken place through the Son." (Page 205.)

XX.

"Is it possible in this life in any way to think or treat of the eternal order of causes which God in eternity considered in the election and the reprobation of men?" Answer: "If Christ and the Word of Christ are in the heart and on the lips and constantly before our eyes, then we may safely and without danger treat of the order of causes. And this will be the manner, according to the Scriptures: God, according to His eternal and unspeakable purpose, resolved, in His eternal goodness, to make known His glory; and therefore, according to the resolution taken in the counsel of the eternal Trinity, He created the human race in His image, in holiness and righteousness, so that it should be and remain forever and should live eternally without anything to trouble it.

Then, however, God (to whom nothing is unknown or not yet present, even if it is still future and has not yet taken place)

---

* How does Missouri agree with Selnecker in the question on the harmonious similarity of these two doctrines, i. e. of election and of justification? — Answer: Selnecker declares, it is one and the same doctrine; and there is no cause in foreordination which is not likewise a cause in justification (e. g. Christ's merit embraced by faith): and the one doctrine can be established through the other (especially as regards these three cardinal points and their mutual relation to each other: by grace, in Christ, through faith). — But Missouri declares it to be the proton pseudos (the fundamental error) of its opponents, that they assume such an analogy or similarity between the two doctrines, and offer to make logical deductions from the one in regard to the other. — [This note occurs in the text of the "Institutu Fidei" as printed in 1883. — Translator.]

foresaw the wickedness of Satan, who would rebel against God, and corrupt the human race, so that with all its descendents it would fall under the judgment of God. Yet, in His eternal, especial, hidden, divine, and inscrutable counsel, He did not at once prevent the wickedness of His enemy and the fall and guilt of man. But He left Satan to his wickedness, and permitted him to be carried away by it, and as the almighty Lord, observing what His godless and impotent enemy contemplated, did not at once oppose him, knowing well how and when, for the glory of His name, He would subdue and destroy the accursed foe.

Having taken counsel with the Son and the Holy Spirit, He decreed the eternal destruction of the enemy. But, moved by His Son (through whom and on account of whom all things are created) as the one Mediator, He did not let the whole human race perish. He willed that the Son should become flesh, and be foreordained according to the flesh unto perfect innocence, purity, inviolability, holiness and righteousness and unto eternal life, and eternal salvation, joy and glory; and that He should be at the same time a ransom and a reconciliation between God and men. And this in order that all who believe in Him might take of His fulness, and that all whom God beheld in Him might in Him be foreordained to eternal life; but that all should be rejected and damned, who were outside of Christ, that is without faith in Christ (ita, ut ex plenitudine ipsius acciperent omnes in eum credentes,et praedestinarentur in ipso ad vitam aeternam, quoscunque Deus in ipso intueretur,* econtra rejicerentur et damnarentur omnes, qui extra Christum essent, id est, sine fide in Christum).

This His secret will God revealed through His Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, and established means for enkindling and confirming faith in Christ, the Holy Ghost being the originator and mover. He, therefore, resolved to gather and

---

* Quoscunque in Christo intueretur! ! God chose in Christ those only whom He beheld in Christ! And did He behold them in Christ as long as they were not through faith in Him, but without faith still outside of Him? Selnecker most decidedly teaches a foreordination unto life in view of communion through faith with Christ, in view of membership in His body. "Quoscunque in Christo intueretur" is in substance precisely the same as intuitu fidei. Note also how Selnecker makes the "separation of persons" depend on faith and unbelief. — [This note also in the text of '83. — Translator.]

maintain a visible church before the eyes of the whole human race, in which His voice would be heard, saying: This is my beloved Son, hear ye Him.

Those, who do hear Him, and do not despise, neglect, depreciate the means, the Word of the Gospel and the use of the Sacraments, or esteem them below transient earthly things, but humbly learn, hear, and prize them, will receive of God the gift of true faith in Christ, as also the Holy Spirit and eternal life. And He forsakes no one who earnestly concerns himself about the means God proposed, but opens to him the Scriptures and his heart, and desires that he may belong to the number of those foreordained to eternal life, i. e. of those justified through faith in Christ. The rest, however, who despise or depreciate the means, and do not strive after Christian godliness, He declares to be unbelievers, impenitent, hardened, godless, reprobate, vessels of wrath, fitted unto damnation, not through any fault of God, but by their own fault.

So much we can and must say concerning the order of causes in the doctrine of foreordination on the basis of the Scriptures. But whatever is above and beyond this is not to be searched out in this life, but remains for the high-school above. It is enough for us to know in what manner we are justified, absolved of sin, received unto sonship, i. e. foreordained and elected unto eternal life and salvation." (Page 206.)

XXI.

"The sum of this doctrine (predestination) is the following: All those who live and die believing in Christ, the Savior, Redeemer, Mediator, and Justifier, are the foreseen (praevisi), chosen, designated,* called, justified, and ordained unto eternal glory and salvation, through the Son, and for the sake of the Son, by the mere kindness, mercy, goodness, and love of God; as it has been well said: God gives, Christ merits or ordains, the Holy Spirit seals and confirms, faith grasps, and good work testifies. On the other hand, all who either live or die without faith in God's Son are reprobate and damned, canceled from the book of life and the record of the justified; not through fault of God,

* "Designati." The Romans gave this title of honor to those chosen for an office, prior to their actually assuming it. An unborn child was likewise called a civis designatus, a future citizen.

who surely created no man for destruction, considering the counsel of creation; but because they did not believe in the only begotten Son; as it is written: Whosoever believeth not in the Son is condemned already, and the wrath of God abideth on him." (Com. in Genesin, p. 127.)

"The revealed will of God is that which shows us through the Word whom He has ordained to salvation, who He desires shall live and be rescued, i. e. all who believe in the Son; and shows us likewise who shall be condemned in His just judgment, i. e. all who do not believe in the Son." (Inst., p. 345.)

"We follow the Word in judging of the election, life, and salvation of those who believe, and of the damnation of the godless." (Ibid., p. 347.)

"It is necessary to have certainty and a good foundation in the doctrine concerning the mode of revealed election or predestination, as the Gospel states this mode, assuring us that all who believe in the Son have eternal life, i. e. are predestinated, and all who do not believe are already reprobate and damned." (Ib., par. 2, p. 114.)

"The sum of this doctrine is, that all who live and die believing in Christ the Savior, Redeemer, Mediator, and Justifier are those whom God has foreseen (praevisi), the elect, designated, called, justified, and ordained unto glory, life, and salvation, through the Son, and for His sake, by the mere kindness, mercy and love of God." (Ib., p. 325.)

"The external election of the Father reposes in Christ and must be sought in Him; the Father has determined in His eternal counsel as revealed to us that He will save none save those who acknowledge the Son, the Immanuel and God-man, as believers." (Thesis 16.)

XXII.

"Why does Christ say: Many are called, but few are chosen? This is no contradiction; nor does He mean that God called such as He did not at all want in the number of the elect, such as He wanted to be damned. For God is not the one to say one thing in words, and mean another in His heart; but it is His will that repentance be preached and forgiveness of sin be promised universally. But the reason for many being called and but few chosen is given in Acts 13, 46: 'Ye put the Word from you and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life.' And Acts 7, 51:

'Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost.' God thus shows that He would have the Word of the Son heard, through which the Holy Ghost works and gives power to believe and keep the Word. But those who do not hear the Word, nor care for it, who despise, disregard, and resist it, are not among the elect, although they are among the called. God's election, however, is not the cause of this; His election, considered antecedently, according to the unconditioned will and the unconditioned grace of God, is just as universal as the promise and the call.* The cause is man's perverted will, turning against God, and refusing with intentional wickedness to permit or suffer the work of the Holy Spirit which He would perform through the Word, stubbornly rejecting this work by wanton resistance, and fighting against it. Few, therefore, are chosen, that is ultimately (finaliter), subsequently (a posteriori), as regards the final outcome (ab eventu), because of man's wickedness and guilt. This is the common answer." (Comm., p. 226.) This exposition is confirmed by the Formula of Concord, Epitome, § 9-12; Declaratio, § 34-42; and even by Luther already in his Hauspostille. But why is Missouri bent on evading and resisting this fundamental passage from the lips of the Savior?

---

* Quae a priori considerata, quod ad absolutam Dei vŏluntatem et gratiam attinet, aeque universalis est ac promisso et vocatio. This passage is of great importance for the correct understanding of the F. C. when it declares: "All men should seek election in Christ"; and when it tells us that election is "proclaimed" in words like these: Repent and believe the Gospel. — Selnecker here calls the "antecedent" will God's "unconditional" will, as distinguished from the "subsequent" or conditioned will. According to the former God wants all to believe and be saved; according to the latter He wants to give salvation actually only to those who believe in time and die in Christ

B. ORIGINAL SUBSCRIBERS AND DEFENDERS OF THE FORMULA OF CONCORD.

ÆGIDIUS HUNNIUS.

Æg. Hunnius: "No cause of justification and salvation dare be found or placed in man. Even faith in Christ, although in us, is not a cause either of justification or of salvation for the reason that it is in us, but only in so far as it apprehends Jesus Christ in His worthy obedience and most holy merit outside of us. And far less dare faith be considered a cause of our predestination, as though it constituted a certain quality in us or a virtue, the dignity and worthiness of which moved God to choose us unto salvation. God forbid! When I and a number of others reckon faith among the causes of predestination, we have added the explicit explanation, that this is to be understood of faith only inasmuch as it is based on Christ Jesus, the rock of our election unto life, and only inasmuch as it relies on the merit of His bitter sufferings and death. And we have stated still further, that this form of expression simply means to say: Christ apprehended by faith is a cause of our election. And this amounts to exactly the same thing as in the article of justification before God; when faith is there termed a cause, and when it is said of faith that it justifies and saves us, this is understood, according to the exposition of all Christian teachers, as saying: Christ apprehended by faith is the cause of our justification before God, and of our eternal salvation." (Writing against Dan. Hoffmann, p. 51.*)

"God in eternity did not look to anything anywhere, outside

* This notorious disturber of the peace, known on account of his rejection of Philosophy as "a work of Satan and the flesh" (Walch, Vol. 1, 173) had assailed the Intuitu Fidei. As a true forerunner of Missouri he wrote: "To be sure, God in eternity saw the faith of His elect, but that faith only which His election would produce. He would not see a faith emanating from us and constituting a cause of predestination, for the reason that such a cause would interfere with a pure election." In the margin we read: "God would see no faith but that which His election should produce" (Apology, p. 60).

of Christ, on account of which He might elect man to salvation; in the same way as, in justification and in the bestowal of salvation, He regards nothing whatever for which He might justify and save a man — nothing whatever save Christ alone, for outside of Christ there is no salvation, and no other name under heaven given among men whereby we may be saved. But God does regard Christ, both in the execution of His eternal purpose, i. e. in justification and in bestowing salvation; and also in the eternal purpose itself, i. e. in His eternal predestination. God, however, regards Christ not merely as having alone rendered complete satisfaction for man; because, this satisfaction, having been rendered for all alike, all would then be chosen from eternity and justified and saved in time. God also regards Christ as the beginner and finisher of our salvation, inquiring therefore also whether He is recognized by faith unto salvation." (Refutation of Hoffmann, p. 46.)

"We deny that God was impelled by the worthiness or excellence of our faith to institute our election. We know that faith in and for itself, like every other virtue, is full of manifold imperfections. And yet, after thus denying to faith any merit whatever in our election, we teach explicitly that God did foresee a certain cause, or rather that He saw and had such a cause, impelling Him to elect us, namely His mercy and the sacrificial offering of His Son; and, therefore, He chose us by grace, in the death of His Son which is imputed to us through faith. If, therefore, we say that the word 'by grace' excludes completely every impelling cause, there will likewise be nothing whatever left in justification impelling God to justify us, save only His mere will. Consequently, Christ and His merit will be ejected from the most holy forum of our justification. But if we are justified by grace, and none the less for the sake of Christ's merit as embraced by faith; — if we are saved by grace, and yet for the sake of Christ's merit as embraced by faith; — why then should God be unable in election also, to elect us by grace, and at the same time also for the sake of the merit of Christ whom we will embrace by faith? —The babble of Tossanus" (the Calvinist against whom Hunnius is writing) "about worthiness is foolish and childish. Certainly, we were not chosen without any worthiness whatever, but on account of the perfect worthiness of the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ. And when faith embraces and holds this merit, it relies on no worthiness of its own, whether it be in the mystery of elec-

tion or in the article of justification; it merely relies as already stated, on the worthiness of Christ's obedience. In this sense we read of those who believe and are chosen: They 'may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God,' 2 Thess. 1, 5; 'they shall walk with Christ in white, for they are worthy,' Rev. 3, 4. So then God is moved to predestinate, to justify, to save, by no worthiness of our own, inhering in our own being, but only by the worthiness of the Savior, which we must embrace by faith.

Our appeal to justification Tossanus* finds a thorn in the eye. He sees well enough that this appeal strangles with irresistible power the arguments he advanced so viciously against foreseen faith in Christ. And since he is unable to reply, he seeks refuge in deceit by declaring: 'As far as this appeal to justification is concerned, which is said to be by grace, although we teach that we are justified by faith, we reply, in the first place, that the Scriptures nowhere say that we are chosen for the sake of foreseen faith.' So far Tossanus. I answer: Neither the Scriptures, nor Hunnius says so, but only Tossanus himself, who slanderously attributes this statement to Hunnius; and, having already been taken to task for it, he now acts against his own better knowledge. Since the answer of Tossanus rests on a falsification, it falls to pieces of its own accord."

"Tossanus adds: 'The Scriptures teach that we are chosen, not merely before we believed, but even before we were born.' I answer: This argument certainly moves us strongly, just as it did St. Augustine, to teach that election is by the grace of Him who calls us, according to His purpose. Furthermore, it moves us to declare that God has received us unto adoption in Himself, thus excluding the Pelagian idea, the merit of our own works (not, however, Christ's merit, which faith alone is to embrace). Now it is silly for Tossanus to use the above remark for the purpose of banishing faith, which embraces Jesus Christ, from the eternal purpose of divine foreordination. Did not God choose us before the Son was sent into the world and before He suffered and died for our sins? Yet we do not conclude that our election is not based on Christ's suffering and death. That would contradict the clearest testimony of St. Paul, Eph. 1, 4: 'He hath chosen us in Him,' i. e. Christ. Now, the death of God's Son

* Like the Missouri Neo-Lutherans, who bravely blow the same trumpet as the Calvinists on this entire question, and have never a word to say in reply to full elucidations of this point concerning justification.

without considering its imputation to us, which takes place through faith, is of no use, either toward salvation itself, or toward election unto salvation. Therefore, it is impossible to eject faith from election, unless Christ Himself who is held fast by the arms of faith is likewise to be ejected. St. Paul has a more correct view; he teaches both explicitly, that we are chosen in Christ, Eph. 1, and that God chose us from the beginning (i. e. from eternity) in faith, 2 Thess, 2, 13. Accordingly, God from the beginning, from eternity when He chose us, had regard to faith, not in so far as faith in itself may be estimated and valued, but in so far as it is based solely upon Christ Jesus, the one foundation of saving election." (Preface to the Tract on Predestination, p. 8.)

"The Scriptures throughout base the eternal counsel and purpose of God's election unto salvation upon Christ, and upon Him not merely as viewed in the work of redemption, but as He is apprehended by faith. In Him we are chosen before the foundation of the world was laid, Eph. 1. Therefore, he who has this Christ, he it is that is foreseen and ordained unto eternal life, as it is written: 'He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life,' 1 John 5, 12, 'but the wrath of God abideth on him,' John 3, 36. And this did not merely come to be the will of God in time, as though it had pleased Him otherwise in eternity. That would be inventing a mutable God. On the contrary, this is His permanent will (also in the purpose of His eternal election), that whosoever seeth the Son and believeth on Him shall have eternal life, John 6, 40. In regard to this passage the Book of Concord declares that in this same Christ our eternal election unto everlasting life is proclaimed. And again: It pleased the Lord God (most certainly in His eternal counsel and purpose) by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believed, 1 Cor. 1, 21. And again: God hath from the beginning (i. e. from eternity) chosen you to salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth, 2 Thess. 2, 13. We do not read: He hath chosen you that you should believe (as though you were chosen in any case whether afterwards you believed or not). No, we read: He hath chosen you in faith; as also St. James writes: Did not God choose the poor of this world, who are rich in faith? Read not: He hath chosen the poor who were to be made rich, but who are rich in fact." (Refutation of Huber, p. 38.)

The following was one of Huber's objections: "If God had chosen only a few for the sake of Christ unto eternal life, there would have to be some cause for this shortening of God's grace in Christ, either altogether in God's pure and partial will toward man, or in the foreseen work and faith of men, placing the cause for the particularization in them." To this Hunnius replies: "Because of a bad conscience Huber dare not quote our view honestly, as it really stands.* He is bound to bring in calumnies, to lead people by the nose, so that they may the less perceive the true foundation and substance of our doctrine. How well does he know that we ascribe neither salvation itself nor election unto salvation to any work whatever! But he is determined to cast the suspicion of papistic error upon us, so he mixes in works here, as he already brought in good conduct† above, claiming that, according to our doctrine, because of these works God made His work of grace particular. Yet he knows well enough that in election we do not include faith in so far as it in itself is a work, a virtue and quality, and possesses a worthiness of its own, but only in so far as faith embraces Christ, in whom God's eternal election is ordered. Compare the article concerning the justification of a sinner before God, where faith justifies and saves man only through the imputed worthiness of Jesus Christ. Therefore, when inquiry is made as to the cause moving God to elect us, we do not point people to our faith simply, but to Christ whom our faith embraces, whose merits and blessings our faith takes and makes its own." (Page 83.)

"Predestination is not absolute, it is ordered in Christ, in whom it took place, Eph. 1. We are not chosen for the sake of our faith, just as we are not justified for the sake of our faith, but through faith. And yet because Christ, outside of (extra) whom election could not take place, is of no use to us without faith, because His merit can be appropriated by us through faith

* This applies fully to the Missourians; they know no better than to revile our doctrine, as though we turned faith into a work, a performance, a virtue, a piece of good conduct, etc.

† Huber had written: "There is no doubt that God knows all things, and we need no proof for it. But the question is whether God withdrew His actum or work of grace because of the future good or bad conduct of men, and made His work particular. This is the thing for them to prove." Then too Huber often accused the Wittenbergers of Pelagianism, because, as he supposed, they made election dependent upon a certain good conduct on the part of man.

alone, therefore, it is plain that the consideration of faith cannot be altogether excluded from the mystery of predestination. For as the apostle testifies in Heb. 11, it is impossible for man without faith to please God, to say nothing of so pleasing Him, with that especial, intimate love, as to be chosen unto eternal life. This especial love towards sinners cannot stand without taking certain regard to Christ's satisfaction, not merely as He wrought it out for sinners, but as it is apprehended by faith. For as God, because of His immutable righteousness, could neither choose sinful man nor love him (with this especial love), without looking to the Redeemer whose ransom satisfied His righteousness, so also this ransom remains alien" (not appropriated nor imputed) "without the hand of faith." (Disp. Marpurg. 1, p. 110.)

"God's election or foreordination unto eternal life is not absolute, either in respect to a few or in respect to all, as though God had chosen either all or a few without regard to Christ, whom faith must know. His election is based on Christ, and is so ordered by reason of its means and the order of its means, that all who submit to this order (huic taxei se submittunt) belong to the number of those foreordained unto eternal life, while all others are excluded from this number, not by the absolute will of God, but by their own unbelief and final impenitence.

Query: What is this order? — Answer: As God in eternity resolved to ordain men unto eternal life, so also He established means, and in His eternal counsel fixed an entire course [or order] for restoring man and bringing him to salvation. He sent the Son to suffer for the sins of the entire world, so that whosoever believes in this Redeemer of the world, and by faith embraces His merit as offered in the Gospel, shall not perish, but have everlasting life. This entire order must be included in God's decree of election, and dare nevermore be removed or separated from it.

Query: Certainly, I believe that Christ must enter into the mystery of predestination, because He Himself has chosen us (John 13 and 15), and because we are chosen in Him (Eph. 1). But I would like to see proof for including faith in Christ in the decree of election. — Answer: That you may understand aright in what sense faith is said to enter into the mystery of election, I beg you to remember that it enters into this mystery only as a part of the above named order. For testimony and proof we appeal to Eph. 1; 2 Thess. 2; James 2. . . . It cannot

but be that all persons chosen unto eternal life must be loved of God, as becomes His children, with a most intimate and perfect love. But it is impossible for any one without faith to be so intimately loved of God, as befits His children. Heb. 11. Consequently, we dare not believe that any one was chosen unto eternal life without all regard to faith in Christ. . . . Since election is an act of the mercy of God toward fallen, sinful man, it cannot take place unless the eternal righteousness of God, which the sin of man offended, has received full satisfaction. From this we conclude the following. The election of sinners unto salvation cannot take place, unless either the sinners themselves render a satisfaction of their own to God's eternal righteousness, or receive that of another, i. e. of Christ, imputed unto them. They cannot render a satisfaction of their own. It follows then, if they would be ordained to salvation, they must render the imputed satisfaction of Christ. But this imputation takes place only through faith, making it as clear as day that regard to faith, in so far as it embraces Christ, cannot be debarred from the election of sinners."* (De Prædest., p. 339 sqq.)

"From the above statements it is clear that the election of

---

* Hunnius here follows strictly the words of St. Paul: Hath any man prophecy, let him "prophesy according to the proportion of faith," that is according to the analogy of faith. For it is one of the fixed and immovable principles of our Lutheran theology, and with God's help will remain such in spite of Missouri, that the doctrine of justification by faith is the chief article, and all others must harmonize with it. Now it is one of the principal parts of the doctrine of justification, that the bestowal of everlasting life, according to God's will, which is ever one and the same immutable will, depends upon the sinner's justification through faith in Christ. "Where there is forgiveness of sin, there also is life and salvation" — and nowhere else! "Vita aeterna promissa est justificatis," our Confession declares. "Eternal life is promised to those who are justified," to those "who are reconciled in Christ; and it is faith that reconciles and justifies before God." Missouri indeed easily evades all this. It tells us: To be sure, in the universal decree of redemption the word applies: "He that believeth shall be saved." Salvation and even eternal ordination unto salvation is here made altogether dependent upon faith, as is evinced also by the fact that God did not ordain many unto salvation for the very reason that He foresaw no faith in them. But "it is false to say, God has foreseen who would believe and therefore God has chosen them, for this is not predestination (Gnadenwahl), it is the order of salvation (Gnadenordnung)." (Report of the Western District, 1880, p. 29.) So then, in the order of salvation, to which justification belongs, God reveals His will thus: Without faith it is impossible to please God; he only who believes

those who are to be saved is not in the province of God's will working immutably without the least regard to Christ as embraced by faith, and simply restricting itself to certain persons* (ad certas personas restricta sit). Yet we do not invent an election which extends over the whole of the human race. God indeed earnestly desires that all should be saved; since, however, the greater number by reason of their own fault (as will appear from subsequent statements) are not saved, these because of their own fault are not numbered among God's children. For, as the Book of Concord declares, God's eternal election and foreordination does not extend to the good and the bad alike, but only to the children of God who are chosen and ordained unto the attainment of everlasting life, before the world began, Eph. 1. To be sure, if all men would believe and persevere in faith, all men would have been predestined to life. But now, since many do not believe, and do not use the means through which God according to His promise desires to work faith in their hearts, it becomes a fact, as our Savior stated, that many are called, but few are chosen. And this paucity of the elect, this particularization of election dare not be used to contradict the universality of God's promises, but must be included in them as something subordinate.† For not the will of God, but man himself is the cause that only a few are saved; as Christ testifies in these very parables, where He expressly undertakes to show the cause why many are called and few are chosen, Matt. 20 and 22. . . . We simply say and teach with St. Paul that election took place in Christ, Eph. 1. Now since no man is in Christ without faith, and no man remains in Christ without faith (John 15), therefore, those who have never believed in Christ have never been chosen. We conclude furthermore, those who have begun to believe and have forsaken faith are cut out of the

---

shall be justified and saved. In predestination, however, God simply ordains certain sinners as they are by nature unto salvation, and thereby also unto faith and unto justification!

* Our orthodox fathers always designated "the children of God," "the godly," and especially "believers" as the proper subjects of election, while the Calvinists, already in the days of Hunnius and later on always, used the specific expression that God had chosen "certain people," "certain persons." Missouri too has shown great love for this naked "certae personae."

† For this very reason it is clearly and explicitly revealed by Christ in His universal Gospel; and in this Gospel we are told to seek our election.

olive tree (Rom. 11), are cast forth as withered branches of the vine (John 15). Accordingly, God was not indifferent in election, disregarding how men would conduct themselves* (quocunque modo se habentes); on the contrary, He has chosen and ordained unto everlasting life, according to His foreknowledge, those of whom He saw and foreknew that they would perseveringly believe in Christ, the Savior of the world; according to the apostle's word: Whom He did foreknow,† He also did predestinate, Rom. 8. Also John 6: Jesus knew from the beginning who would not believe in Him." (Disp. Witeb. Hunnii, p. 227.)

"If Christ is the cause of our election by reason of His obedience and merit, He is such either absolutely, without imputation through faith, or relatively, in so far as His obedience is imputed to us through faith, and Christ Himself is embraced by us. Taken absolutely, however, without the imputation of faith, Christ's obedience is of no use to us. Hence Christ with His obedience is the cause of our election in so far as He is brought in relation to us, and His merit imputed to us through faith. Consequently, faith dare not be excluded from the mystery of election. They, then, teach most correctly concerning predes-

* Missouri, however, emphasizes this as the chief point in its doctrine of predestination, claiming that when God desires to bestow His grace, He makes no inquiry as to the different conduct of men. Many a father, we are told, "is more gracious to one child than to another, because it is more obedient and gives him more pleasure. . . . . God deals with us in the same way, only He does not even inquire whether we have obeyed Him or not; He does simply as He pleases." Neither Calvin himself nor any Calvinist has ever taught a more absolute grace ("absolutissima gratia" as the Genevans termed it at Dort). The libitum of Dr. Walther is the exact merum beneplacitum of the Calvinists, who likewise love the expression: quoscunque libuit! For Missouri to presuppose God's universal mercy and Christ's universal merit, does not alter the thing itself. It is none the less God's libitum, and not faith, which produces "the distinction of persons."

† Quos praescivit. It may not sound smooth in German [and in English], "to foreknow a person." The Latin itself is not overly smooth, yet our fathers frequently used the expression so as to bring out their meaning clearly, namely: While God forces no man to believe, granting to all liberty to remain in unbelief and wilfully to reject salvation in spite of His gracious offer to call and save, yet He knew in advance, by reason of His omniscient foreknowledge, those who believe in Christ, knew them as His own, whom the Father had given to the Son, who are therefore accepted unto adoption and unto the inheritance of life eternal — according to His purpose. John 1, 12.

tination or election who compare it properly with justification, showing that what God in eternity determined concerning us in election, is now carried out in time through justification. For this reason our churches teach that the causes of election are the same as those of justification. As, therefore, no one is justified except those who by faith embrace the grace of their justifying God, so also no one is elected in eternity except those of whom God foreknew that they would embrace the grace of election. Nor does this say that we are chosen on account of our faith. As we are not justified on account of faith, but through faith, or on account of Christ embraced by faith, so also we were chosen in eternity, not on acount of faith, for the sake of its worthiness and merit, but through faith, or rather through and on acount of Christ as embraced by faith. . . . As, therefore, faith depends upon the decree ordaining the means, so also, it is most certain, the choice of persons depends on the grace of God and the merit of Christ, considered not apart from faith, but as apprehended by faith" (p. 232).

"Not this is the controverted point whether we are chosen on account of or for the sake of our faith as foreknown by the omniscient God, as though He had been moved by the quality or worthiness of faith to elect us, and as though we by our faith had furnished Him cause for our election, as Huber lyingly attributes to us.* For we explicitly deny that faith enters into the article of predestination in any such way. We say that faith is included in the eternal act of election only on account of its correlative (the object which it appropriates), in so far as it embraces Jesus Christ, the rock of our salvation; for without faith neither the grace of God when He calls, nor the merit of Christ can be appropriated. Therefore also, without the slightest uncertainty, we declare that in us there is no cause which could have moved God to institute our election. For not even faith, either as regarded in itself or as found in us, can possibly penetrate into the citadel of predestination, but only as it turns away from itself and looks to Jesus Christ, the world's Redeemer, and embraces Him. Hence it is clear, that we do not teach, nor is this the point

* And as Huber's worthy successors, the Missourians, likewise lyingly state the doctrine of their opponents in the same way; for they know well enough that we too mean only Christ and His merit as apprehended by faith, and not faith in itself without Christ as its contents.

of controversy, that we chose God through faith before He chose us, and that we thus anticipated His election through our faith.* That this is not our doctrine, but Huber's malicious slander is evinced by our confessing that election took place already before the founding of the world, while faith is generated through the Word in time; in fact, we declare that we cannot believe, unless God of His mercy works faith in us through the Holy Spirit as a result of His gracious predestination."†

"To elect unto salvation is to determine or decree from eternity, before the time of the world, whom (among men) God at last will actually save. But He has resolved in eternity that He will actually save only those who believe. Consequently, He has chosen only believers unto salvation. For, according to His antecedent will, He indeed earnestly desires that all may believe in the Son and so be saved by faith; and, according to His counsel and pleasure, He resolved to send His only begotten Son into the world; yet because the greater part of the world does not believe in the Son, therefore He does not actually save all, but only those who believe. Mark 16; John 3. Hence our conclusion remains valid, that God already in eternity determined to save those only who believe in the Son; or (which is the same, as already stated) He has ordained and chosen them from eternity. This argument is overthrown by no trick or counter-arguments, it remains unshaken until it is proven that it is not the same thing, to elect men from eternity unto salvation, and to decree that men shall actually be saved. To attempt such proof would be to contradict the Scriptures, and likewise the Formula of Concord, which in its Epitome explains the term 'election' by saying: 'In Christ, therefore, we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who, in His eternal divine counsel, determined

* Hunnius, in this passage, as far as election is concerned, takes everything from faith as regarded by itself or as merely inhering in man, and gives everything to Christ as apprehended by faith, not (as Missouri desires) to Christ as still unappropriated by sinners without faith and still unknown to them. In other passages he does the same thing in regard to justification. In both articles Christ as well as faith occupy identical positions, and sustain the same relation to each other. Neither Christ apart from faith, nor faith apart from Christ constitutes the adequate (complete) cause of election, but only Christ as apprehended by faith.

† In what respect Hunnius, and we with him, consider faith "as a result of God's gracious predestination," — referring even the faith of temporary believers back to God's eternal decree — we shall see later on.

that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him.'* This Christ Himself teaches in the Gospel, John 3, 16, where He states the antecedent will of the eternal Father in the following words: 'God so loved the world.' Furthermore: 'God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved.' And since not all the world receives this Son, He has also fixed the decree of eternal election, in His subsequent will couched in the following words: 'That whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' And again: 'He that believeth on Him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.'† In the same way Christ explains the decree of predestination unto life in these words: 'This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life,' John 6, 40. It cannot be objected here that these words do not speak of the decree of election. For it is most certain that this is the Father's will not merely in time; it was the will of God already in the counsel, purpose, and decree of predestination, before the founding of the world; and in this will the

* Open your ears, ye Missourian foes of the Intuitu Fidei! Here, if anywhere in the Book of Concord, is a brief, concise definition of election. Why, then, have you never taken note of this most important passage! Perhaps it does not suit you? It should be noted especially in the above citation that Hunnius sets forth his doctrine as the clear teaching of the F. C. And this was the man who, on the 14th of September, 1577, being then professor at Marburg, subscribed the F. C. with the following words: "I, Ægidius Hunnius, subscribe the Book of Concord in all its articles throughout with all my heart as with my pen." But, according to opinions at St. Louis, the original subscribers did not understand the F. C.!

† Missouri, indeed, evades this by means of its twofold decrees. The one is the revealed and universally valid decree of redemption, declaring: "He that believeth shall be saved." The other, said to be the secret decree of election, applies only to certain individual sinners in Adam, and declares concerning them a purpose contradictory to the former: Because I am resolved to save you most surely in preference to others, therefore I choose you unto salvation and unto all means necessary to its attainment, thus also unto faith. For these latter sinners, therefore, the gracious will of God is at once a decreeing will, without any mediation whatever through faith; for the rest God's gracious will can become a decreeing will only then, when He foresees their faith in Christ. To be sure — "an entirely different thing."

reference to faith in Jesus Christ was fixed, that he alone who believes in Christ should have everlasting life, and be chosen thereunto, while whosoever believes not, or will not in time believe His grace, shall not be chosen unto eternal life, but be already condemned. For this reason the Book of Concord uses this word of the Savior (John 6, 40), without the slightest ambiguity, to explain (explicare) the decree of election, saying: 'Christ as the only begotten Son of God, who is in the bosom of the Father, has published to us the will of the Father, and thus* also our eternal election to eternal life, viz: when He says: Repent ye, and believe the Gospel; the kingdom of God is at hand. He also says: This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life. And again: 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.' All these passages, one like the other, limit the election of God, with expressed determination (expressa determinatione), exclusively to those who believe in Christ. This also St. Paul declares, 1 Cor. 1: 'It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.'" (Disp. Witeb. p. 284, 285.†)

* "Hac ratione," really by this procedure, in this manner, by this method or means of instruction.

† Let the gentlemen at St. Louis — we certainly may say — possess all possible secrets, and be fully grown Goliaths in the battle against synergism, if only they would let us keep the Lutheran faith of our childhood, that which we — God be praised! — learned in the parochial school at St. Louis and in the Seminary, as being both according to the Scriptures and the Confession; if only they would not seek to rob us of this faith by means of their mysterious absurdities, and cease decrying it as synergism! Yet with all their art they will not be able to alter the fact, that, in regard to the actual bestowal of salvation, God 1) has but one gracious will toward all sinners; that 2) He has clearly revealed this true will of His in the Gospel when he declares: "He that believeth shall be saved" — and none other; and that 3) already in eternity and in election He resolved to consider faith in the same sense and after the same manner as He now actually considers it in time. His will decreeing in eternity and His will executing in time are not two contradictory wills in God, but ever one and the same will. He only who believes shall be saved, so declares the Father's eternal election, so therefore also His execution in time.

THE WITTENBERG FACULTY.

The Faculty of Wittenberg* writes in the year 1596: "When faith is introduced in the article of predestination, it must not be understood as though God chose us for the sake of faith on account of our merit, or that we were chosen of God because He saw in eternity that we would believe in Christ, and thus show ourselves worthy of His grace and election. On the contrary, this is the correct understanding of the blessed doctrine of faith: God in eternity ordained true faith in Christ as the one blessed means and instrument for apprehending and appropriating the precious merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, Rom. 3, 4. 14; Gal. 3, 4; John 1, 3. 6; since we were chosen, not outside of Christ, but in Him, before the foundation of the world was laid, Eph. 1, and no man is found in Christ, except it be through faith, through which He dwells in our hearts, Eph. 3, and through which we are joined to Him and grafted into Him as living fruitful branches of the vine, John 15; Rom. 6. Hence we believe, teach, and confess that living faith in Christ must have its proper place in the doctrine and complete description of God's election unto eternal life, as an exceedingly necessary and altogether indispensable part. The Christian Book of Concord also reckons faith in Christ among the eight points which must be taken together when we

* Dr. Walther states in "L. u. W.," 1880, 45, that the Wittenberg Faculty at that time consisted of "orthodox theologians"; he produces extracts from their writings against Huber to show how these "orthodox theologians taught concerning the relation of faith to predestination." Hunnius, Leyser, and Gesner were the authors of this "Thorough Refutation." Leyser had become professor at Wittenberg already in 1576, and there he subscribed the F. C.; in 1588 he succeeded Chemnitz, as his best friend, in Braunschweig; and in 1593 he returned as professor to Wittenberg. He labored zealously for the introduction of the F. C. as a bulwark against Calvinism. Although, already in 1594, he went to Dresden as chief court-preacher, he always continued to take a direct personal interest in the writing of the Wittenbergers against Huber. Sal. Gesner was a young man of 21 studying at the University in Strassburg when the F. C. was published (1580); in 1586 he became rector in Silesia; and in 1593 professor at Wittenberg. Now it is incredible enough, to begin with, that these men should have misunderstood the F. C. so completely as to imagine its true teaching to be the very doctrine which the Formula itself rejects as one "not to be tolerated, a blasphemous and dreadful false doctrine." Yet it is far more incredible that in these faithful orthodox times

speak of God's eternal predestination unto adoption, just as the Epitome declares that God, 'in His eternal divine counsel, determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him.'" (Thorough Refutation of Huber, p. 27, etc.)

The "Thorough Vindication of the Articles of Visitation" (p. 299) declares: "We are indeed chosen not on account of faith, as also we are justified before God not on account of the worthiness of faith, considered by itself as a quality or virtue. On the contrary, faith is demanded after this manner: by true and living faith we are to accept the grace of election, which has been offered to us in Christ and has approached us through His redemption, and are to apply it to ourselves and make it our own." On this the Wittenbergers have the following to say: "From these words we learn that in the article of God's election unto eternal life faith dare not be taken otherwise than in the article of the justification of a poor sinner before God. When then we say, with the Word of God, that man is justified before God through faith in Christ, it is plain that no merit whatever is ascribed to faith, but that faith is taken only as the means, instrument, and spiritual hand whereby we embrace the grace of God, promised us in Christ, and make it our own. For, in the first place, faith is not in our own power, it is the work of God, John 6; Eph. 2; Acts 15. Then, in the second place, we are justified by faith not in so far as faith is in us, or constitutes a gift or virtue in the regenerate, but in so far as faith is viewed apart from man, in

---

—only 12 to 16 years after the introduction of the F. C.—all these thousands of original friends of the F. C., still living in Germany, the subscribers and defenders of the F., including one of its authors even, should all have snored in such profound slumbers, when Hunnius, with a few others to aid him, swept the pure doctrine of predestination, which had just been publicly laid down in the Confession, completely out of the Church, and in doing so appealed for his support most emphatically to the F. C. itself, which, as Missouri tells us, explicitly rejects his doctrine and teaches the very contrary. Indeed, Missouri expects much of us, when it asserts that all these original theologians of the F. C. in Rostock, Wittenberg, Leipzig, Tuebingen, etc., had already, in opposing Huber, "forsaken the Scriptures and the Symbol" and begun to abuse both badly. But the splendor of its growth has led Missouri into pride and arrogance, and it has been overtaken by a fall in doctrine, so that it has lost all sight and hearing, and nothing now will cure it. But let us hear what these "orthodox theologians" really believed and taught.

the grace of God and precious merit of our Lord Christ. Then faith justifies us before God when it exhibits to our heavenly Father the perfect obedience and precious merit of Christ, 1 John 2, 1." (P. 28.*)

"Just as we are justified, not on account of faith as a work and merit, but through faith, inasmuch as we embrace the merit of Christ by faith; so too we are chosen of God unto eternal life, not on account of faith, but through or in faith, as St. Paul writes 2 Thess. 2, 13: 'God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth.' And just as we by faith embrace not justification itself, but the merit of Christ, and become justified when we accept Christ in true faith; so also faith embraces not election itself, as Dr. Huber imagines, but the grace of election and the Lord Christ in His merit,† and they who appropriate Him in faith are the ones that are chosen in Christ, Eph. 1. So then faith is included in predestination precisely as it is taken in man's justification before God. Indeed, faith enters predestination only in so far as God has ordained it to be a blessed means and gives us faith through the Holy Spirit, Acts 15; Rom. 10, and in so far as it takes its stand outside of ourselves in the mercy and pure grace of God. And therefore it is plain that Dr. Huber‡ accuses us from mere fractiousness, when he represents us as making faith to be a thing so precious and important in the eyes of divine majesty, that for the sake of its worthiness and merit God chose us unto eternal life; whereas we ascribe all this to faith only in so far as it relies upon Christ" (p. 29).

"Just as little as our righteousness is based on our faith as a work of our own, so little also is predestination based on our faith as a merit of our own. This was already fully explained above, when it was stated that faith was considered in justification and in election not inasmuch as it is a quality or virtue in ourselves, but inasmuch as it embraces, outside of ourselves and in God, the mercy of God and the precious merit of Christ. Since now it has pleased God to justify us through faith, and to elect

---

* Hence faith is considered here not as the beginning of man's renewal, but as a means for appropriating Christ.

† Dr. Walther quotes the passage up to this point in "L. u. W.," 1880, 45.

‡ Missouri does the same thing to-day.

us in belief of the truth, 2 Thess. 2, 13, the immovable foundation and corner stone of our election rests by no means in us, as though we had destroyed or rendered uncertain the counsel and order of God, but it rests only and wholly in God's gracious will and in the precious merit of Christ. And even though we should deny the faith, and forsake God, and break the covenant, God still remains true and cannot deny Himself. And though we should fall from faith, God's immutable counsel still stands unmoved. And this, because God's election looks not to certain persons* or a certain number of men, but applies only to believers. If Peter believes, he is among the number of the elect; if he falls away and remains in unbelief, God's counsel still stands unmoved, He still wills that all who believe in the Son shall be saved" (p. 32).

"Our heavenly Father regards the saving suffering of His dear Son in election, and not our work.† But He does not

---

* That is to a mustering of sinners in Adam, after the manner of Calvinistic Missouri: "This man and that and the other" — without any reference whatever to repentance or faith, simply according to a "free purpose" — are chosen 1) unto salvation, and hence 2) also unto all means. All who teach such a free mustering of sinners unto the certain attainment of salvation, thereby clearly teach an especial particular will of grace in God, according to which God awards and bestows eternal salvation upon "certain persons" not on the basis of Christ's merit as embraced by faith. This contradicts God's universal will of grace, which is revealed to us thus: He that believes shall be saved; and not "certain persons" shall be saved.

† Our readers will, we hope, be pleased to have us place before them the testimony of the original subscribers and defenders of the F. C. in all its fullness. St. Louis tries to make it appear as though the doctrine it now rejects and reviles under the name "Intuitu-fidei theory," was introduced by the dogmaticians of the 17th century, at least 40-60 years after the adoption of the F. C., as the general doctrine of the Lutheran Church. But the facts in the case are, that it appeared clearly already in the controversy with Huber, in the years 1592-1598, what was the general doctrine of the Lutheran Church on the basis of the F. C., and what was declared to be its correct meaning by the original authors and subscribers of the Formula in the universities at Rostock, Wittenberg, Leipzig, Tuebingen and Marburg, and was acknowledged to be such by the remaining thousands of subscribers. The utterances of these men of the F. C. are so clear and distinct that an honest person would never think of offering the plea, that he cannot grasp their meaning. For with one accord they all teach that the choice of persons unto the infallible attainment of salvation, the real decree concerning the bestowal of salvation upon certain

regard our Lord Christ merely in so far as He furnished the ransom and purchased the heavenly treasures for us. On the contrary, He regards it in this manner, that when we have embraced His merit in true faith, and applied it to ourselves, and made it our own, it then through faith becomes our merit, as our Lord Christ is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption, 1 Cor. 1, 30. God does not simply proceed to justify all men, in view of the merit of Christ and of the lofty work of redemption, as this in itself was accomplished once by Christ. He justifies them when they take this merit of the Lord Christ to themselves in living faith, and fold themselves in it through faith. How much less then will our heavenly Father elect all men* unto eternal life, simply in view of the cross of Christ. They must take and keep the death of Christ by a strong and firm faith; and this the more, since justification,

---

sinners in preference to others, has foreseen faith for its presupposition, because this choice is based on Christ's merit, and Christ is apprehended personally by individuals only through faith. Missouri may imagine that it understands the F. C. better than did all these its original subscribers in all orthodox universities; a sober mind will smile at such childish arrogance. But Missouri itself has acknowledged and emphasized, even in the beginning of the present controversy, that the doctrine of our old teachers concerning the relation of faith to election in Christ, is the same as that of the F. C., and is according to the Scriptures. The question now is as to this doctrine, and these testimonies of the men of the F. C. are to exhibit it clearly and fully.

* Here the Wittenbergers reject the doctrine of Missouri, that God ordained certain sinners in preference to others unto the infallible attainment of salvation, simply on account of Christ's merit as wrought out for us and not yet apprehended by faith; thereby making faith in our Lord Jesus Christ assume the subordinate role of a mere means for carrying out God's decree, without having decided, or now deciding, anything. Where is there a word in the Bible saying that God decreed infallibly to save certain sinners for the sake of Christ's merit merely as wrought out for us, without regard to its appropriation by faith? Where is it written that for certain sinners the fixed decree of their salvation flows simply from Christ's merit as wrought out, while it does not flow so simply from this merit for others, but depends on their appropriation of Christ's merit; and for this very reason this decree is not passed upon them, because God seeks faith in them, but does not find it? And does not every child see that two contradictory wills are predicated, when God, in the first place, is made to tell all men: "For the sake of Christ I will decree the salvation of you all, but only if you believe in Him"; — and then is still made to say to the elect especially: "No, not on the condition of faith, but simply for the sake of Christ"?!

according to St. Paul's doctrine, Rom. 8, is so completely incorporated in predestination, that there can be no predestination unto eternal life without justification" (p. 41).

"Never has this been our opinion that faith, in so far as it is a quality in us, or a work and an act of our own, could cause predestination; as also it cannot and dare not in this respect be called a cause of justification. But aside from this, if only we are one in the thing itself, namely in the doctrine that God has chosen in Christ to eternal life, not without any regard whatever [nicht bloss dahin], but only in gracious view of faith, those who believe in Christ, and not those who are without faith — we will dispute with no man concerning faith, whether it be termed a causa (cause), synaition (a cause among others), or something necessary, membrum (a member) and requisitum (a requisite), or a quality, property, and attributum (attribute) of the elect and therefore also of predestination.* Everything depends on

* This declaration of the theologians of the F. C. is exceedingly important. "If only we are one in the thing itself," they say, in regard to the relation between election and faith, then "we will dispute with no man concerning faith," in regard to the technical term, whether faith is to be termed a cause, a cause among other causes, a necessary thing, etc. And what was the thing itself wherein all Lutherans were required to be one? This, "that God has chosen in Christ to eternal life, not without any regard whatever, but only in gracious view of faith, those who believe in Christ, and not those who are without faith"; that therefore election is to be sought not in the unappropriated merit of Christ. And this very thing Missouri now rejects most decidedly, and teaches that God's mercy and Christ's merit alone, in itself, without appropriation by faith, constitutes the complete cause of election. We are told that God chose certain sinners, still lying in the universal depravity, simply for the sake of Christ's merit as wrought out for us and not yet appropriated by faith; and that He declared: "These shall and must be saved, and as surely as God is God these will be saved, and besides these none others!" What shall we say when we hear that these people, who are now so determined to exclude all regard to faith from predestination, claim always to have had this doctrine! Did not Dr. Walther write often, emphatically, and clearly that he by no means rejected or disapproved of the doctrine of the fathers, but objected only to the expression intuitu fidei? As regards the doctrine, the thing itself, he agreed most heartily, he told us, with the defenders of the intuitu fidei. And, we are here told, in regard to the mere term there shall be no dispute, "if only we are one in the thing itself"! In 1872, when Dr. Walther's deviation from the doctrine of our old teachers had already been publicly attacked, he still wrote in "L. u. W.," p. 139, highly offended because of the accusation: "Our Synod confesses most decidedly that the theologians of our Church in the 17th century taught the correct doctrine

this: faith dare not be excluded; and predestination dare not be sought altogether, without faith in Christ, in the mere will of God and merit of our Lord Christ, even though it be unappropriated by faith — as Huber* declares. On the contrary, we must teach with the Christian Book of Concord and accept the declaration of its Epitome: 'The Father, in His eternal divine counsel, determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him.'" (P. 106.)

Crypto-Calvinism in Saxony, as is well-known, occasioned the publication of the articles of Visitation (Visitationsartikel), which were drawn up in 1592 by six theologians appointed thereto. Among these there were at least four of the original subscribers

---

concerning predestination, and maintained it against the Calvinists; this one thing only our Synod objects to in the doctrinal presentation of these theologians, the expression, 'God has elected intuitu fidei' is 'an unhappily chosen terminology.'" Really, what can we say to this? In one place we read: "Our Synod," at that time, confessed "most decidedly" that the defenders of the intuitu fidei had "the correct doctrine concerning predestination," — the doctrine, therefore, of the Scriptures, of the Confession, and of Dr. Walther himself! — "taught" it in their dogmatical and polemical writings, and "maintained it against the Calvinists." Then again we read that this "our Synod" does not to-day agree with the fathers in the "intuitu-fidei-theory," i. e. in the doctrine of election which our fathers really meant and maintained against the Calvinists. And in the third place we are told that, in spite of all this, the Synod has always held the position it now holds on this point, and Dr. Walther in particular always believed, taught, and confessed what he holds to-day, and teaches to-day what he held then. This is what they do who delight to call others liars, hypocrites, etc.!! The case is exceedingly simple: If the Synod in the past really agreed with our old teachers in "the thing itself," then some one is lying now in saying it has always held its present position. If, however, it did not agree, then Dr. Walther lied at the time when he wrote that it did agree!

* And with him Missouri. To be sure, they differ from Huber in the extension of the idea of election; Huber applies election to all men devoid of faith, Missouri only to some of them. But in regard to the essential idea of election — this that Christ's merit as prepared for us, without regard to its appropriation by faith, causes election — Missouri agrees fully with Huber; and therefore, its doctrine is rejected by the Wittenbergers like the doctrine of Huber. For the Wittenbergers do not say that Huber's idea of election is correct in itself, being merely in a wrong way extended to all men; they reject the very substance of this election of men devoid of faith.

of the Formula of Concord, viz: Mirus,* Mylius, Loner and Hunnius. The last of these was the real author of the Articles, as also of the "Thorough Vindication" of these Articles issued by the same six theologians in the following year. And here we find the following "correct doctrine concerning predestination" maintained against the Calvinists: "God was not moved to predestination by the consideration of future works or worthiness of the elect; yet it does not follow from this that God had regard to nothing whatever, save His own mere will. For the Scriptures testify explicitly that we are chosen through Christ, and through Him ordained unto adoption in Himself. So then God's gracious and merciful election is based on the secure foundation and rock, Jesus Christ, to whom we are to cling by faith. And now we are chosen and ordained unto adoption, but only in Christ; and we all can be saved, but in no way except through Christ. For this is the will of the Father, that whosoever seeth the Son and believeth on Him shall have everlasting life."

"Therefore also, Christ is called the Book of Life; not as though God determined to save a number of men in Him, while He absolute excluded the rest from salvation, and ordained them to hell; but for this reason, because the counsel of God stands firm, that no one shall be saved except in Christ, and God the Father hath made us acceptable unto Himself through the Beloved.

---

* Martin Mirus, born 1532, professor at Jena, at the time of the publication of the F. C. court-preacher in Saxony, as such he subscribed the Formula. He, together with Hunnius, Mylius, Leyser and Selnecker, were called for a visitation of the churches on account of the Crypto-Calvinism which had crept in. Died 1593. — Joshua Loner, born 1516, studied at Wittenberg and took the degree of Magister there, subscribed the F. C. when Consiliarius at Henneberg; Superintendent in 1592, and Dr. of Theology in 1593. Died 1595. — George Mylius (also called Mueller), born 1544; Dean in Augsburg in 1572, where he subscribed the F. C.; in 1585 professor at Wittenberg, at Jena in 1598, and again at Wittenberg in 1603, where he died in 1607. He generally took part in the discussions with Huber. We regret that his Disputationes against the Calvinists are not accessible to us, as they will furnish further important testimonies of this zealous and faithful theologian of the F. C. — Hunnius, called to Wittenberg in 1592 to suppress the Crypto-Calvinism which had crept in. Already in 1585 his Commentary on John's Gospel appeared; in it he frequently touches on predestination, and treats this doctrine fully in connection with the sixth chapter. Very likely the F. C., in which, for the first time, the Lutheran Church laid down its confession on this article. caused this question to become a point of controversy between Lutherans

. . . Just as God's eternal predestination flowed originally from His great love and then based itself on Jesus Christ as the rock of salvation, so also faith in Jesus Christ is included in this election, without which neither the grace of Him that calls nor the merit of Christ can be apprehended. We, indeed, are chosen not for the sake of faith, just as we are justified not for the sake of the worthiness of faith as it constitutes a virtue or quality in us. Faith is demanded that by it we may embrace God's eternal election, which is offered us in Christ, and extended to us only for the sake of His redemption; by true living faith we are to apply to ourselves and appropriate for ourselves this gracious election of God. And this faith is bestowed upon us by the preached Word, and not without means, as was fully set forth above. All those, therefore, who receive this Word and abide in it by faith, have salvation, through the sacred gracious will of God, most assuredly. All those, however, who reject this Word in unbelief, and will not account themselves worthy of eternal life, must ascribe the guilt of their damnation not to God's predestination, but to their own unbelief." (145, 147.)

When in 1599 the so-called "Book of Staffort" made its appearance, in order to justify the Margrave Ernest Frederick of Baden for having abandoned Lutheranism in favor of Calvinism, the theologians of the Electorate of Saxony (among them Hunnius, Mylius, Leyser) were appointed to issue a refutation.

---

and Calvinists. In 1586 the Colloquium at Moempelgart occurred between Andreæ and Beza, again bringing up this controversy, and directing the eyes of theologians on both sides more than ever to this point of difference. In 1587 the Commentaries of Hunnius on Romans, Ephesians, and 2 Thessalonians followed, in which he again set forth his doctrine explicitly that election took place in view of faith. Now who bought and read Latin works, if not the Lutheran theologians who, a short time prior to this, has signed the F. C. in all lands? And this Hunnius, whose doctrine on predestination was known far and wide, is placed beside Selnecker and Leyser to establish the pure doctrine of the F. C., also in this very point on predestination: while, as Missouri says to-day, he had already publicly "forsaken the Scriptures and the Symbol", and indeed understood and interpreted Article XI altogether incorrectly! Did then the Lutheran Church have for its teachers nothing but blockheads in these thousands of subscribers to the F. C.; men who had no inkling as to what doctrine they had really subscribed in Article XI, or who never noticed that Hunnius and his immediate friends and co-laborers taught, in essential points, the very opposite of what (according to Missouri's assertion) the Formula really contained? Is it not ridiculous to presume such a state of affairs?

Naturally also the doctrine of predestination was mentioned. The Margrave, indeed, did not wish to be called a Calvinist, yet he attempted "to remove from the act of predestination the consideration of faith in Christ." His book, accordingly, contained the admonition, "that we should beware of speaking of the foresight of faith or of works in us, as though we were so much better than others that for this reason God has chosen us in preference to others; we should rather speak of God's eternal gracious knowledge (Gnadenerkenntnis*)." To this the theologians of the Electorate of Saxony replied as follows: "We desire His Grace, the Margrave, to have all our books and writings examined (if His Grace cannot examine them himself), whether any of us has ever taught that God has chosen us for the sake of foreseen faith. For this word 'for the sake of' (propter — um willen) indicates a meritorious cause, as though faith possessed such worthiness and merit, that for its sake men were chosen of God. . . . But His Grace, without knowing it, confirms our opinion, since such 'gracious knowledge' of God does not exist apart from Christ, inasmuch as God ordains to salvation not such as are by nature altogether holy, and hence do not need Christ, but sinners only does He choose and ordain. But, if God would not contradict His own eternal righteousness, He could ordain sinners unto life only for the sake of Christ's merit, in whom this predestination took place. But if Christ's merit is considered merely in itself, without its application and appropriation by faith, then the Confession" (of the Margrave) "itself testifies above that this merit is of no benefit to man. God does not 'graciously know' any man without faith; indeed, the Epistle to the Hebrews declares that it is impossible. We give the apostle's own word: Without faith it is impossible to please God. Hence we conclude: If a man cannot please God without faith, then also he cannot be graciously known of God and ordained unto salvation without this faith; for assuredly His fatherly grace must be highly pleased with those whom He ordains unto salvation. Now it is impossible to please God without faith, Heb. 11. Therefore also, it is impossible to know any man in grace, and ordain him to salvation, without faith. For without faith Christ's

* The Calvinists have always accused the Lutherans of teaching that God has chosen us "for the sake of foreseen faith." Missouri dishonestly perverts the doctrine of its opponents in the same way.

merit remains foreign to us, and, as we read Gal. 5, Christ (without faith) profits us nothing. Pray, how has Christ's merit, without any consideration of faith, come so to profit some men in the sight of God, that He, notwithstanding they have no faith, nevertheless ordained and chose them to salvation?" (P. 571.*)

"We do not climb with our blind reason into God's secret counsel, when this question is proposed to us" (why God chose some, and why He did not choose some); "we simply answer with the Scriptures, the reason why God chose some is His undeserved mercy and grace and Christ apprehended by faith. So the entire Gospel testifies. If then we are asked, why the rest were not chosen, we reply with Christ: Because they do not believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God, John 3. Moreover, they despise the means ordained of God for working faith and salvation; as it is written: It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye have put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles, Acts 13." (P. 587.†)

---

* Huber taught that all men were chosen for the sake of Christ's merit as obtained for us. Many German Reformed (like Missouri to-day) say that only some men are chosen for Christ's sake without regard to faith. Both doctrines are rejected by the theologians of the F. C., who say: "Pray, how has Christ's merit, without any consideration of faith, come so to profit either all men, or some men, in the sight of God, that He, notwithstanding they have no faith, nevertheless ordained and chose them to salvation?" And of these men Missouri is able to say: They are "orthodox theologians", even as regards the doctrine of predestination; they have "taught the correct doctrine of predestination and maintained it against the Calvinists"; — while this is the very central point in Missouri's doctrine, that God has chosen some sinners for the sake of Christ's merit merely as obtained for us and not yet appropriated by us, and has ordained them unto eternal salvation (and hence also unto all means).

† As far as God's selecting is concerned, these men of the F. C. say, God's decree is based on "Christ's merit as apprehended by faith", while the rejection of the lost is based on their unbelief and their despising the means. Missouri generally tells us that election is based on Christ's merit, but only in so far as it has been wrought out for us. And here "the mystery" is said to be, that God should be willing and able to ordain some to salvation in this way, and not the rest; that He should seek faith in these latter, before being able to determine whether they too are chosen. Who does not see that, if God can at all elect and ordain men to salvation merely for the sake of Christ's merit as obtained for us, then it is no "mystery" at all that He should really so elect some, since it is His earnest will to help all mankind? Then the real mystery would be this: Why does

"The Margrave's Confession desires to have the mere, free, and righteous will and pleasure of God, and His infinite mercy recognized and admitted as the only cause of our predestination. This can be done, when the particle 'only' is understood to exclude the will of man, in the same manner as in the justification of a sinner before God, where also no other cause is admitted save only the pure grace and mercy of God, as based on Christ's merit and imputed to faith. For God, on account of His righteousness, can show no mercy to sinners, either in eternal predestination, or in its execution in time, i. e. in justification and the bestowal of salvation, without regarding the satisfaction rendered by Christ; this satisfaction propritiates His righteousness, so that, without contradicting it, His mercy can go forth unto sinners. If, however, the Margrave's Confession means to exclude, by this exclusive 'only,' also the suffering and death of Jesus Christ; if it means to tell us that God chose some unto life without regard to Christ's propitiatory sacrifice; then we must say, it is now proven that this is utterly impossible without conflicting with the immutable righteousness of God. Moreover, this would cancel the apostolic declaration (the limiting phrase): 'He has chosen us in Christ,' Eph. 1; 'He has predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself.' These passages undoubtedly declare that in the divine act of election, in ipsissimo actu Electionis, no man was ordained unto life before, or without, or apart from Christ; on the contrary, regard to Christ must precede ratione ordinis, non temporis, i. e. in the very order of election itself, not merely in time. And this for the reason that God's righteousness would prevent the election of sinners unto salvation before, or without, or apart from regard to Christ's merit. For, evidently, St. Paul did not mean to have this limiting phrase ('in Christ,' and 'by Christ') understood merely of Christ's person (as we might also say that we are

---

God refuse to elect and ordain the rest in the same way? Why must He first see repentance and faith in these before declaring salvation also for them? And how can any sensible man say that this is not inputing to God a will of grace altogether unequal (ungleich)? — on the one hand, we are told, God ordains some to salvation merely for the sake of Christ's merit as obtained for us (and not yet appropriated by faith); on the other hand, God will not ordain the rest unto salvation merely for the sake of Christ's merit as obtained for us, but in their case looks and asks also for the appropriation of Christ's merit by faith!

chosen in the Father and in the Holy Spirit). St. Paul here refers to a very especial respectum or regard, which applies to Christ alone, and to neither of the other persons of the Godhead. He here refers to Christ in His highpriestly office, to His most holy propitiatory sacrifice, which, to satisfy the righteousness of God, He was to render in time. This can and dare never, in reason, be contradicted. As soon, however, as Christ is placed in this respectu into the actum Electionis, the act of election, it becomes impossible to exclude faith. For if Christ is regarded merely in reference to His merit, apart from faith, Huber's universalism is bound to follow; then all men without distinction, unbelievers as well as believers, would be chosen unto life, since the merit of Christ, apart from its application or imputation through faith, extends over all men, that is, has been obtained for all. But God has chosen only those who believe, as the Margrave cannot deny, and his own definition declares. And this, therefore, is the complete conclusion following from God's predestination and ordination, yea, from the eternal will of the Father: he who believes in Christ, the Savior of the world, has eternal life; he who does not believe, shall be damned, Mark 16. From this it follows that the counsel of God contains two separate decrees, namely the decree and conclusion of salvation, embracing those who shall believe, and the conclusion of damnation, embracing unbelievers. All this could not be, if faith had been excluded from the counsel and purpose of predestination (p. 598)."

"As often as Hunnius refers to faith as it is included in eternal predestination, he always explicitly mentions its object, namely Christ, so that all the world may see that nothing is ascribed to faith as it is considered in itself, but only inasmuch as it looks to Christ Jesus and relies on His bitter suffering and death. This point, too, which especially serves as an explanation, the Margrave passes by in silence, that the real meaning of Hunnius may not be noted. Once indeed the Margrave's Confessions, in mentioning the opinion of Dr. Hunnius, and in speaking of foreseen faith, touches upon its object, namely Christ embraced by faith; but this is only per occasionem and accidentally, presuming to refute this view of faith, as shall be shown in its place. In every other case our opponent simply puts it: præscita fides, præscita fides (foreknown faith)! But we leave it to any man's impartial judgment whether it is proper, in disputing and writing

books against an opponent, to steal and strike away all those points which serve to explain the chief question at issue and make clear the opponent's meaning, so that by the omission another meaning may be forced upon the other party" (p. 602*).

"The Margrave objects to the distinction Hunnius makes when he declares that foreknown faith belongs to predestination and is its instrumental cause not as regarded in itself, but on account of Christ whom faith embraces. Here our disputant declares: 'This is simply denying our contention.' He asks: 'What is this but saying that not faith, but Christ embraced by faith is the cause of our election.' Here Margrave Ernest Frederic again fails to consider what is in his favor and what is against him. For Hunnius and we with him accept the statement: 'Not faith, but Christ embraced by faith,' and consider the latter expression more convenient, since the former must be regulated and explained by it. He teaches and confesses throughout, that, to speak strictly, not faith, but Christ, still Christ embraced by faith, is the cause of our eternal salvation. If the Margrave permits such statements to pass — and he wishes to be regarded as doing so — he simply upsets everything he has argued for with such great and useless trouble above. For if Christ embraced by faith is the cause of our election, then surely faith, inasmuch as it embraces Christ, must be included in predestination; nothing will ever evade this. But when now we are asked whether foreseen faith moved God to elect us, we answer no. For nothing but His own boundless mercy and the great merit of His Son moved the Lord our God to elect us. Yet since Christ's merit is a cause of our predestination, and He without faith would be of no benefit to us for our salvation, but only inasmuch as He is imputed to faith and embraced by it, therefore Hunnius used the expression: 'Faith is a cause of our election'; concerning which, however, he explicitly states that he will not quarrel with any one. Moreover, he has always opposed the false notion of merit in faith, and has always and constantly taken faith as directed to Christ alone. If in the points under consideration the little word cause, according to the Margrave's Confession,

* The tactics of St. Louis are here finely described! Missouri possesses a like mastery in stealing away all the chief points which serve to bring out the correct meaning of its opponents, and forcibly imputes to them all manner of heresies.

could be employed only of something that moves God to our election, then also in the article of the justification of a sinner before God faith would not dare be placed among the causes of justification; unless the foolish notion were entertained, that faith possesses such worthiness as moves God to declare us free from sin and just on account of it. Yet in this article also, not faith, but God's mercy together with Christ's merit is the moving cause, absolving us poor sinners before the judgment-seat of God, declaring us just, and saving us. This single point in refutation is enough to destroy and turn to water all the Margrave's useless argumentation on this subject." (P. 614.*)

"Furthermore, it cannot be commended that the Margrave's Confession attempts to alter the point at issue by intimating that we teach that something foreseen in us, namely faith, is a cause of our predestination. Yet we have put faith into predestination not as it is something in us, a virtue, a quality, a habit, but as it regards outside of us the propritiatory sacrifice of Christ and confidently relies upon it. But the Margrave's Confession brushes aside this correlative or object of faith and disputes simply against 'foreseen faith.' In other respects, when it is asked which doctrine furnishes the better and more abiding consolation, that which removes all regard to faith in Christ from predestination, or that which includes a proper regard to faith in God's Son, it needs very little exertion to show clearly that Calvinistic predestination leads either to despair or to a wild, reckless life, so that people think (and their thoughts would be correct, if the doctrine were well founded): If I am chosen, nothing can harm me, I may do as I please, I must still be saved; I would be converted at least in the end, so that I would reach the goal to which I am chosen.†

---

* This single point, the position of faith in justification, as also in its eternal decree as a necessary part of predestination, affects the Missourians to-day just as it did the Calvinists of old. They cannot refute the point itself, which has often and at great length been argued against them; hence they employ the far more profitable tactics of remaining still as mice.

† In what respect would there be any essential difference in this regard between Calvinistic and Missourian doctrine? We know very well that Missouri does not teach in regard to predestination much that Calvin taught. But as regards this absolute and unconditional foreordination which "never asks whether we have obeyed or not", there is no difference; and the practical consequences are likewise identical; they inhere in the doctrine.

But if I am not chosen, then nothing anywhere will help me; even if I should hear God's Word all my life, pray, etc., it is all in vain, because only those can be saved whom God elected unto salvation absolutely and without regard to faith in Christ." (P. 620.) Let it be noted: absolutely is here identical with: without regard to faith! This is the teaching of these theologians of the Formula of Concord!

THE WUERTEMBERG THEOLOGIANS.

The Wuertemberg theologians, among them quite a number of original subscribers to the F. C. (e. g. Heerbrand, Osiander the elder, Margirus, Bidembach, Binder, Holder,*) often in their Acta Huberiana of 1597, touch upon the question concerning the relation between the particularity of election and the universality of God's gracious will and promises. They never say that here we have an insolvable contradiction or an unrevealed mystery, inasmuch as on the one hand God indeed declares that He would save all, yet on the other hand actually has free compassion only upon whom He will have, and hardens whom He will harden. No, the Wuertembergers explain the particularity of personal

* Jacob Heerbrand, born 1521, studied at Wittenberg under Luther and Melanchthon, and on account of his midnight diligence called the "Swabian night-owl." In 1550 he became Superintendent at Herrenburg. In 1560 he together with Jacob Andreæ introduced the Reformation in the margraviate of Baden. Later he was made professor at Tuebingen beside Andreæ and signed the F. C. Since 1592 he took part in the Huber controversy, and in the most important writings of the Wuertembergers against Huber his name heads the list. But his fundamental thoughts were correct already long before this time; this appears clearly from expressions published by him 20 years earlier. (For instance the decree concerning the bestowal of salvation, election in the narrowest sense, the "separation of persons" in those to be saved and those not to be saved — he does not place it outside of the universal counsel of grace, nor beside it as a second counsel, but into the universal counsel of salvation, subordinating it to this counsel, accordingly making it depend on the apprehension of Christ's merit by faith.) Then already he wrote: "The fact, that the number chosen to eternal life is certain and known to God, does not militate against the universal and altogether gracious promises of God. Although all are called, and God says that He would make all men happy, yet we must not suppose that God will save all men, no matter how they live and conduct themselves. . . . . On the contrary this universal promise must be restricted, in the way prescribed by the sacred Scriptures

election from the revealed eternal purpose of God: "He that believeth shall be saved"; and they appeal repeatedly to the words of the Formula of Concord: "In Christ we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who in His eternal counsel decided that outside of those who acknowledge His Son and truly believe in Him He would save none." Accordingly the Wuertemberg signers of the F. C. understood the Formula as deducing the particularity of election from the necessary restriction of the divine purpose: "that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." For God did not decide without anything further, either that He would have all men, or that He would only have some men come to salvation; on the contrary, as far as the actual attainment of salvation, and likewise as far as the decree of election is concerned, God's gracious will was restricted by the purpose: "He that believeth shall be saved." This explanation of the particularity of election and of its relation to the universal will of grace Missouri rejects as a solution of the mystery, as false doctrine, as a forsaking of the Scriptures and the Symbol. It asserts — do not laugh, dear reader! — that it understands the F. C. far better, and knows far better what the true meaning of the Confession is in this article, than the original authors, signers, defenders, and Church of the Formula

---

themselves. to all those who repent and believe in Christ. . . . A godly man hears from the Word of God that all who truly believe are chosen of God to eternal life." (Disp. de Electione, th. 89 sqq.) — Luke Osiander, sen., since 1569 Superintendent at Stuttgart; was "very busy with the Formula of Concord" (Joecher); attended the Colloquium at Moempelgart in 1586 as one of the participants, when Jacob Andreæ in the name of the Lutherans publicly defended the proposition attacked by the Calvinist Beza as Pelagian: "Faith is a cause of election; took an especially active part in the controversy with Huber; died in 1604. — John Magirus, born 1527, died 1604. — Eberhard Bidenbach, born 1528, since 1557 Dr. of Theology, died 1597. — Wilhelm Holder, Superintendent at Stuttgart, died 1608. — Christopher Binder, born 1519, since 1562 General Superintendent at Adelberg, where he signed the F. C. — All these were theologians of the old days, who together with Gerlach, Leyser, Hunnius, Chytræus and others opposed Huber, and taught that particular election, or the "separation of persons" into salvandos et non-salvandos, took place with respect (respectus, consideratio) to foreseen future faith, and does therefore by no means contradict the universal promises of grace, but is to be subordinated to them in clear agreement with the words: "He that believeth shall be saved." They indeed taught both: 1) the universal will of grace, and 2) particular election; but not like Missouri, as two different counsels standing side by side, and really contradicting each

of Concord itself. But let us hear the testimony of the Wuertemberg theologians of the F. C.

"We do not understand the particularity of election in the Calvinistic sense, as though God determined absolutely, in His hidden counsel, simply according to His mere will and pleasure, to save only some few among men, and to ordain all the rest, according to His eternal and unchangeable counsel, unto damnation. On the contrary, the predestination and election of God in the narrow sense is called particular, because it embraces only those who by true faith accept the proffered grace and merit of Christ, appropriate, and retain it till the end. For predestination is nothing but God's eternal will, counsel, purpose, and pleasure to save by the foolishness of preaching those who believe. Voluntatem Dei antecedentem, the antecedent and universal will of God, is the name given to God's universal love for the whole human race: inasmuch as He has compassion upon all alike, gave His Son as a Savior for the whole world, offers such grace to all nations most earnestly, and desires that all men may accept it by faith and be saved. In this gracious will of God no man was forgotten and none excluded. Voluntatem Consequentem, the subsequent will of God, is the name given to the divine decision, that God ordains to salvation, and in His good time glorifies, those who accept the proffered universal grace and the Redeemer Christ, that on the other hand, however, He rejects and condemns those who do not accept the proffered grace and merit of Christ; and this on account of their impenitence and unbelief, despising and rejecting the means of salvation."* (Page 3.)

other, without the possibility of their being harmonized by our knowledge from the revealed Gospel. They find this harmony of the universal will of grace with the particular decree of salvation clearly revealed, and together with the F. C. they explain the separation of men into elect and non-elect from the revealed will of the Father: Whosoever seeth the Son, and believeth in Him hath eternal life. Yet this very doctrine of election unto salvation Missouri ridicules as a "self-evident conclusion", an attempt "to make the mystery of predestination plausible to reason", etc., and finds in the F. C. an election of men devoid of faith and irreconcilable with the universal will of grace!

* This then is the "correct doctrine of predestination", as these men of the F. C. taught and defended it from the Scriptures and the Confession. This very doctrine of the original signers of the F. C. erring Missouri now slanders as a miserable "self-evident conclusion" from the universal will of grace. Yet, because it is too cowardly to say right out that it rejects and antagonizes as false and erroneous the clear doctrine of these F. C.

"Faith is placed into God's election only as an ordained means or hand, with which we embrace and draw to ourselves the merit of Christ (on account of which we were chosen). And this in the manner as we are justified and saved, not for the sake of faith, but for the sake of Christ, whose merit we apply to ourselves by faith. For without faith we have no part or common lot in Christ and His blessings, and are not competent of receiving either election, justification, sanctification, or the promised glorification." (Page 15.)

"Eph. 1, 4, furnishes no hold at all (for Huber) to prove a universal election of all men. For Paul here speaks plainly of the 'saints and the faithful,' and defines election as regards Christ; but where He is not known and not embraced by faith there no election takes place." (Page 38.) In the German edition we read: "Paul says, moreover, that we are chosen in Christ. For those who do not acknowledge and accept Him by faith no predestination takes place."* (Page 50.)

"We could not conceive that you (Huber) wished to have the orthodox opinion of the F. C. overthrown, according to which election applies only to God's children. We see that the origin of your error lies in your failure to understand that between the universal love of God and the absolute decree concerning only a few who necessarily will be saved, there lies a certain middle path, namely this very order that all believers in Christ are chosen, and besides these none shall be saved." (Page 71.) In the German text we read: "Hence this, as far as we can find, is the chief cause of your error: you fail to note that between God's universal love and His mere counsel and will (by which some men are ordained to salvation so that they cannot lose it) there is a certain middle path," etc.†

---

theologians and of all later acknowledged orthodox teachers of our Church, it "makes lies its refuge and under falsehood hides itself" (Is. 28, 15), and writes with an impudent brow: "Our Synod acknowledges most decidedly that these theologians taught the correct doctrine of predestination"! !

* So taught the original confessors of the F. C. and thereby held "the correct doctrine" of predestination, as Missouri tells us. Of course, Missouri also declares that this was not the correct doctrine, but rather a fundamental error, with which it would have nothing to do; yea, that this is rationalism!

† This "middle path" between the universal will of grace and the Calvinistic "mere will" Missouri also denies, and refuses to admit an election

"We readily conclude that the particularity of election is embraced and included in the universal Gospel promises of grace. (Facile concedimus, quod Electionis particularitas ad Evangelicarum promissionum universalitatem subalterne se habeat.)" (Page 96, 148.)

Huber appealed to the fact that Brenz and others had spoken of a universal election of all men. The Wuertembergers reply: "These excellent teachers, some of whom already rest in God, never held the opinion that all men without any difference (Turks also and all unbelievers and the impenitent) are ordained and chosen to salvation, absolutely, and without any regard to faith."* (Page 159.)

"The Saxon Book of Visitation" — i. e. the "Thorough Defense" of the well-known Articles of Visitation — "demands three things as constituting complete election. First, the most gracious will of God, according to which He had compassion upon the whole human race fallen in Adam, and sought ways and means for rescuing it. Secondly, the Lord Jesus Christ with His perfect and most holy merit. Thirdly, true and living faith, through which we make ourselves partakers of Christ's propitation. This is far different from Huber's claim, that election took place absolutely and without regard to faith. Huber, therefore, wrongs the authors of this book, writing as though they taught a universal election embracing even the unbelieving."† (Page 164.)

Huber had written: "In the whole controversy there is no question at all concerning faith as applying and appropriating

---

of believers as such. It prefers to teach that God's gracious will is double and dissimilar: in one instance a will which decrees without anything further (for the elect); in the other a will which does not decree, a will which waits for faith.

* Missouri indeed does not say with Huber that all men are chosen, but with the Calvinists that only some "are ordained and chosen to salvation, absolutely, and without any regard to faith." This difference, however, does not effect the essence of the idea of election, but only the extent of election. Huber, in this respect, is better situated than Missouri.

† And Missouri wrongs these theologians of the F. C. and of the Articles of Visitation still more, for it appeals to them as though they had taught, in harmony with Calvin and Missouri, even a particular election which applies to the unbelieving. According to Huber's election of men without faith salvation at least was open to all men alike; but according to Missouri's election this is not the case, since persevering faith is said to flow from this election which does not apply to all.

to man the blessing of redemption; the whole question is on the will and counsel of God and the redemption as wrought out by Christ." The Wuertemberg theologians of the F. C. answer: "This is most assuredly the question at issue whether the Actus or work of election is something absolute, standing by itself, without regard to faith, or something dependent on faith, and hence applying only to the godly and faithful (an actus electionis in se, absque respectu fidei consummatus, an vero respectu fidei limitatus)." (Page 110, 173.)

Again Huber wrote that Hunnius "invented a new opinion" when he taught the particular election of believers. The Wuertembergers reply: "How can Huber say that Dr. Hunnius began this doctrine, that God ordained to salvation only those who retain faith till the end, and afterwards defended it from jealousy against him, when our Church many years ago universally approved of this doctrine and accepted it?" (Page 174.)

"When we ask what divine election is, when we seek to know which men God chose unto eternal life, to which of them He will give the kingdom of glory and eternal salvation, we answer correctly that not all men, but only those who believe are elected unto salvation. This is what the Book of Concord explicitly and in so many words declares. The words read: Predestination or the eternal election of God is occupied only with the godly, beloved children of God," etc. (Page 294.) We cannot deny, if we wish to speak according to the norm of divine truth, that God does not give eternal life to all men alike, but only to those who believe. And Paul means the same thing when he says that we are chosen in Christ, before the foundation of the world." (Page 297.)

"The Scriptures declare that God indeed would have all men come to a knowledge of the truth and be saved, but that He predestinated and ordained to salvation only those who perseveringly believe in Christ. We do not deny this universal ordination, or rather this universal will of God, that the whole human race may be brought back to salvation by faith in Christ. But this is not predestination and the ordination unto salvation as designated and explained in the Holy Scriptures and the Formula of Concord, since this is occupied only with those who by true faith embrace and apply to their own person and appropriate the gracious will and counsel of God regarding His pardon for the whole human race. 'This predestination and ordination unto

salvation took place through Christ and in Christ' — but not outside of faith or without regard to faith, since without faith Christ does not benefit us."* (Page 305.)

"Although there is essentially but one will of God, yet, that we may treat with you (Huber), and for the sake of greater clearness, as though it were in school, we will call God's universal good pleasure His antecedent will, concerning which we believe and confess, in accord with the reasons shown from the Scriptures (Ezek. 33; 1 Tim. 2; etc.), that it is truly universal and is occupied with all men. . . . According to this will God thirsts with earnest desire for the salvation of all men, offers it to all, begrudges it to none, desires that all sinners may be converted and live. In this charitable will and good pleasure of God, desiring to rescue the whole human race and to save all by faith in Christ, not a single soul among them all has been forgotten or omitted. . . . But because our merciful and kind God foresaw in His omniscience that all men would not by the obedience of faith accept the mercy proffered them, but that most of them would reject it by unbelief, He so defined His will regarding men, that those who believe are really to enjoy the proffered blessings and receive salvation, but those who do not believe are to remain without these blessings and are to perish. Many passages of Scripture prove this with the greatest clearness: Mark 16, 16; John 3, 18; Matt. 11, 27. This further definition of God's judgment we call His subsequent will. And this will (unlike the former) is by no means universal, but is limited by its regard to the obedience of faith, or to disobedience, on the one hand to believers, on the other hand to unbelievers. This will is furthermore unlike the antecedent will which has no contrary decree; it is divided into contrary decrees by its regard to the believing and to the non-believing, those who believe are to be saved, and those who do not believe are to be damned. After prefacing this, we must say, if we would deal uprightly with you, that we cannot approve of your removing the consideration of faith from the antecedent will of God (or from universal election), and of your saying that it is Pelagian and absurd to consider faith in the

* Even these Wuertemberg men of the F. C. use the expression: "Christ does not benefit us without faith." Missouri, however, "self-evidently abhors" it, although in its established and fixed meaning it constitutes a universally accepted axiom (fundamental truth) of evangelical theology.

especial election of believers. This you will never be able to prove with a single Scriptural passage. For God in His eternal counsel did not ordain men to salvation absolutely, but in Christ, through Christ, and for the sake of Christ, and through the regular means. For just as God in His antecedent and universal will wanted all men to be saved, so also He wanted all men to believe in Christ, for whose sake we are chosen; as the apostle says: God would have all men to be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth. And God did not in His counsel, purpose, and decree ordain a single man unto life absolutely, without regard to faith (in His antecedent will); but as He wanted all to be saved, so He also wanted all to believe. . . . Nor does faith come into consideration only at the time when Peter or Paul begins to believe and appropriate the grace of universal election; on the contrary, according to the Scriptures the consideration of faith is a necessary element in the doctrine and order of the counsel and good pleasure of God in saving man. For as God purposed to save all men through Christ, so also He wanted all to believe in Christ, and determined to save no man without faith." (Part 2, p. 28, 29.)

"Election and reprobation are in many respects like saving and damning. For as man is justified and saved by the pure grace of God, on account of Christ's merit, not on account of faith, but through faith, and as he is damned on account of unbelief; so also man is elected unto life for the sake of Christ, not for the sake of faith, and yet not without regard to faith, through which Christ, for whose sake we are elected, must be embraced. But the unbelieving are rejected of God (according to His subsequent will, which takes into consideration the obedience of faith or the disobedience) on account of unbelief, which constitutes the first cause of rejection, and originates therefore not in God, but in man." (Page 101.)

"In all his writings Huber maltreats foreseen faith in an astonishing way. He dreams that when this faith is abolished, the whole doctrine of particular election will fall to the ground. That the reader may understand our opinion in the question correctly, we will state the whole matter briefly. In the first place, when we speak strictly, it is more correct to say that God knows, than that He foreknows, that He sees as in the present, than that He foresees. All things are present before God. Secondly, when we treat this article carefully, it must be said that foreseen faith

is not the foundation of election; this foundation is the will, purpose and eternal good pleasure of God desiring to save believers in Christ, 1 Cor. 1: 'It pleased God (and this in eternity) by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe,' meaning simply, to elect believers unto life. Whoever then believes in the course of time belongs, according to this eternal good pleasure and decree of God, to the number of the elect and is saved; whoever does not believe is, by virtue of an eternal decree, damned. This eternal decree is revealed to us in the Gospel, Mark 16; John 3. In the third place, God, to speak humanly, foreknew who among men would obey His eternal counsel and ordination; and they who were thus foreseen of God were ordained unto eternal life, according to God's eternal counsel and purpose. In the same way God from eternity foreknew who among men would not obey His eternal counsel and ordination, and these are by the same God given over to death on account of their unbelief, according to His just judgment. Hence it is clear how God ordered His election according to His eternal counsel (which demands faith); and how, when He foresaw, or saw, that all men would not obey His universal counsel, He subordinated to His universal will (according to which He would have all men believe and be saved by faith in Christ) this decree, that believers shall be saved, and non-believers shall be damned. And this subordination is implicitly contained in the further definition of the universal will inasmuch as it is not absolute, but limited in view of faith."* (Page 102.)

"When it is asked, what the character of this eternal act of God (election) is, then let Huber know that it is defined by the

---

* Really, one does not know what to say or think, when he reads such and similar exceedingly clear and precise expositions of the doctrine of our fathers (in this case the F. C. theologians of Wuertemberg), and then calls to mind how Dr. Walther, even yet in 1872, when he claimed to have recognized this very doctrine already long before as erroneous and objectionable, could write and print such declarations as this: "Our Synod acknowledges most decidedly that the theologians of our Church, also in the 17th century, taught the correct doctrine of predestination, and maintained it against the Calvinists." As the expositions of this doctrine are so extensive, so unmistakable in their clearness and precision, and so exceedingly numerous in the writings of our fathers, and as Dr. Walther could not but know them well, there remains but one conclusion: either the Synod at that time really was unanimous in this doctrine, or Dr. Walther has lied most shamefully.

order, which God Himself established in His eternal counsel, that those who believe in Christ shall be saved. Those of whom He foreknew that they would believe in Christ, He foreordained especially unto eternal life according to this order established by Him in eternity. From this it is clear that personal faith is not the foundation or chief cause of election, since faith was placed in the counsel of election only as a means for receiving salvation. The true foundation is God's will itself, according to which it pleased Him in eternity to save men in this and in no other way and order. Huber fails of the truth in explaining particular election, when he says that election, which on God's part is universal, becomes particular through man's fault, and is called particular in respect to its application and result. Although the cause of this particularization is in man, yet election is called particular not merely in respect to its application or result; for God Himself in His eternal counsel formed the decree, that — as He would have all men to be saved through faith in Christ according to His antecedent will, so now since all would not obey the order He established — those who believe shall be saved, non-believers, however, shall be damned. Election therefore is particular, and is called such in respect to this eternal decree of God, not merely in respect to the application made in time." (Page 145.)

"Just as predestination did not take place without regard to Christ's merit, so also it did not take place without regard to faith in Him. Neither will it help Huber out to add to his election the declaration, that there are many who do not embrace the blessing of election, and hence are guilty of unbelief and just damnation because of the rejection of this blessing. For Huber claims* that the eternal act of election itself needs nothing beside the mercy of God and merit of Christ to make it complete, and that as far as God is concerned all men are elect whether they believe or not. Afterwards, however, he tells us, when God revealed this mystery, He instituted the order, that those who believe (i. e. appropriate this grace) should also enjoy it unto salvation, whilst those who do not believe (i. e. do not appropriate this grace) shall not enjoy it. Furthermore, Huber with his imaginary election subverts the particular election of believers which is taught in the Scriptures and in the Book of Concord; and this

* Just like Missouri to-day, which likewise considers God's mercy and Christ's merit, considered in and by itself, the adequate cause of particular ordination to salvation.

cannot be tolerated in the orthodox Church. But we have already shown above that faith is taken into consideration already in the eternal act of election itself, and dare not be placed merely into the application." (173.)

"If Huber had included the consideration of faith in the act of election itself, he never would have been able to deny on the part of God the particular election of believers, nor would he have opposed to it his universal election. For it has been demonstrated above that a universal election or will of God which includes the consideration of faith, is not contradictory to the election of believers. But as Huber opposes his (universal) election to the particular election of believers in such a way as of necessity to abolish the latter, it follows that his election contains no consideration of faith. For to say with Huber: 'All men are chosen in Christ unto life prior to any consideration of faith,' or, which is the same: 'Without regard to faith'; and then to say: 'Only those who believe are chosen' — is to state a flat contradiction. But as Huber would like to persuade his readers that he has spoken only of the complete act of election, inasmuch as he states that indeed all should believe, we desire to let the reader know that Huber's meaning was this: God has chosen and ordained all men, believing and non-believing, unto life in Christ, prior to and without any consideration of faith or unbelief. Then, after this act was complete through God's mercy and Christ's merit, God added the condition of faith, and appointed unto men that they should believe and by faith receive the life in Christ. Accordingly, the first thing in Huber's order of election is this, all men, whether future believers or not, are chosen unto life in Christ and for the sake of Christ; the second is, they are chosen unto this that they may believe, and thus by faith in Christ may follow (as he himself expresses it) whither in the act of God (which is complete through God's mercy and Christ's merit) they were chosen."* (Page 196.)

* Here it appears how closely Huber's idea of election is related to that of modern Missouri. We have only to put instead of "all men" the words "only a few" who are considered in this election (which is unto faith) as persons without faith. Huber regards the act of election as being complete only through the mercy of God and merit of Christ, taken in and for itself; Missouri does the same. Huber excludes any regard to future faith from the act itself; Missouri does the same. Huber, however, adds that the elect are also chosen that they should believe; Missouri does the same. Yet Huber's election of persons without faith is more evan-

JOHN WIGAND.

John Wigand* in his Syntagma of the year 1575 defines predestination entirely in accord with the doctrinal manner of his time and hence also of the Formula of Concord. He says, it is "in general the decrees which God formed and afterwards revealed in the Word, regarding the causes and the manner of saving and damning." (Chemnitz in his Examen has the same broad idea of predestination.) He then proceeds to divide "predestination" into 6 separate decrees termed "res prædestinatæ" (things predestined). The third decree reads: "It is a decree of God, that He will work a saving conversion in the hearts of men through the hearing of the Word, namely repentance and faith in Christ, and that He will save those who believe without any merit or works of the Law, but that He will blind and damn those, be they Jews or Gentiles, who despise the Word and obstinately resist it. That this decree is revealed in the Word of God Paul teaches Rom. 10. He teaches that according to this decree the Jews are rejected, and the Gentiles received unto grace — when they hear the Word and believe in Christ."

"This decree, to save without any merit all those who obey the Gospel and believe in Christ, Paul refers to the will revealed in the Word and the grace therein promised; as it is said: I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. And:

---

gelical and scriptural than that of Missouri. He excludes no one from his election; whereas Missouri makes the highest manifestation of God's love and mercy, ordination unto salvation, absolutely particular, makes of it a second and that an absolutely particular will of grace, and then attempts to see in this twofold, dissimilar will of love and grace a very "wonderful mystery"!

* Our Synod of the F. C. theologians has not yet closed its sessions. It is exceedingly important that the Lutheran Church of the time of the F. C. should give us clear and precise testimony, by its chief representatives, in what sense it universally received the F. C. as its confession — whether in the sense which the later Lutheran Church confessedly found therein, or in the sense which Missouri now attempts to find. Even if the sense of the Confession, according to the language used, were ambiguous and doubtful, which however is not at all the case on this point, it would belong to the unanimous voice of the Church which had just made this Confession its own, to pronounce the decision as to the sense which must be attached to the language of the Confession, and how it must be understood and interpreted, inasmuch as it is not the private confession of an individual, but the public and joint confession of the Church. — John

He that believeth in Him shall not be put to shame. . . . And we must judge concerning predestination according to the Gospel, which contains the universal promise, and according to the causes of predestination, which are God's mercy and grace. For as often as Paul speaks of election unto salvation, he leads our thoughts to the will revealed in the Gospel. . . . When John in Rev. 20 mentions the Book of Life, he speaks not of a secret will of God, but of that will which is revealed in the Word of God, that He would save all sinners, and damn all unbelievers. . . Paul desires that we firmly trust it to be impossible for God to mean anything different from what is revealed in the Word, namely that He will certainly save all believers, and all who persevere in faith; nor are we to dream for ourselves a catalogue of the saved differing from those who truly believe in Christ. . . . The Gospel is simply the revelation of the decree of God: 1) Whom He has ordained unto eternal life, namely all men; 2) From what causes, namely on account of Christ's merit and from grace; 3) How, namely if they believe and persevere in faith. He has revealed to us the mystery of His will." (Synt. p. II, 639.)

"The fact, that God graciously receives some, and rejects others, belongs to this general proposition: God will save all believers, and will damn all non-believers. This is the one (una), constant, immovable, and established judgment of God" (Solutiones bei Schluesselburg 6, 212). "It is God's decree, that He will bestow the gifts obtained by Christ upon all who believe in Christ, but not upon those who have no faith, John 3. In this revealed will of God we must of necessity seek rest" (p. 228).

It is especially important that Wigand takes as the first "cause" of predestination præscientiam (foreknowledge), and as proof for this: Quoniam quos præscivit, eosdem et præfinivit (Whom He did foreknow them He did predestinate).

Wigand, born 1523; studied at Wittenberg in 1540, "where he formed the acquaintance of Luther, Melanchthon, etc." (Joecher) and was made Magister in 1545. In 1553 he was Superintendent at Magdeburg; in 1560 professor at Jena; in 1562 Superintendent at Wismar; in 1577 Bishop in Samland, where he signed the F. C. and died in 1587. He wrote a mass of polemical works, among them one entitled: "Whether the new Wittenbergers (i. e. the Crypto-Calvinists) have always hitherto taught in agreement with the fathers.

MATTHEW VOGEL.

Matthew Vogel:* "Although many, even more men than are saved, perish, yet the decision of God to save all men in Christ, is not thereby altered, much less invalidated. For this decision is confined and limited to all believers in Christ" (Thes. p. 593). "Since all the called do not believe the Gospel, but remain unbelieving, more men are damned through their unbelief than are saved by believing in Christ; the latter are by far the smaller number compared with the godless and hardened multitude. Yet the universality of the evangelical promises does not militate against the particularity of election or against the small number of true believers and elect of God. For as God's decision remains unaltered, to save all believers, so also the decision of God remains firm, to damn all those who do not believe in Christ" (p. 594).

G. MYLIUS.

G. Mylius (see note above) writes: "As foreknowledge is not the cause of foreseen faith, so also, and much less, foreseen faith is not the cause of election, in the sense as though men are or were elected on account of foreseen faith. And yet, although no one is elected on account of faith, not even on account of foreseen faith, just as little as any one is justified on account of faith, it must still be held fast that, as believers are justified through faith, so that somehow faith must be added to the order of causes in justification, faith also, and that foreseen faith, although excluded from the number of efficient, moving, meritorious, or similar causes, dare not be excluded in the capacity of cause altogether, especially not in the capacity of an established condition (conditionis ordinatæ)." (Apolog. 3, 4, th. 24.)

"If only this simple and general rule receives enough atten-

* Born 1519 in Nuernberg; studied 1534 at Wittenberg; was made Magister there in 1542, and "after receiving praise on examination by Luther, Melanchthon, and Pomerano (Bugenhagen)" (Joecher) pastor at Lauffen near Nuernberg. On account of the Interim he went to Prussia, where he was made professor in 1557 at Koenigsberg. In 1569 he was Superintendent in Wuertemberg, and as such signed the F. C. He worked more than 40 years on his main work, the Thesaurus Theologicus. He had a clear premonition of his death, set his house in order, and died December 3, 1591, in the 73rd year of his age.

tion, that the causes of election are the same as those of justification, this whole matter will become so clear that it will appear exceedingly unworthy for theologians to continue to dispute among themselves about it." (Apolog. 3, 4, 27.)

"You wish to know the essential part of the matter? It is God who from pure mercy, in Christ the Savior, chose and predestinated to eternal salvation those who believe and persevere in faith. You desire to know what is of secondary importance? This election took place in eternity, before the foundation of the world" (th. 29). "Since the Scriptures themselves emphasize foresight, Rom. 8; 1 Peter 1, they show us that this circumstance must also be considered" (th. 30). The limited number of the elect depends on the event of faith. For that only so many and no more are chosen is not because God did not wish to have more, but because only so many and no more believe in the Son; as Christ declares: He that believeth not is already judged. And: As many as received Him, to them He gave the power to become children of God. This limitation of the number, however, is certain because of the divine foreknowledge. For God sees in advance, yea sees and knows from eternity who will believe." (3, 7, 5.*)

On Rom. 9, 18: "He hath mercy on whom He will have

---

* But here too Missouri is not at a loss. At one time we are told, the cause of reprobation or non-election is clearly revealed: God foresaw that the non-elect would despise and reject His grace in time, hence their unbelief is the cause of their non-election. Then we are told, this precisely is the mystery of predestination, that in the case of so many millions whom God earnestly desires to save, He does not remove this resistance "which He could remove just as easily as in the case of the elect" — and this evidently declares that the cause of particularity belongs to the unrevealed will of God. Furthermore: at one time Missouri tells us, in the act of election, when those who were to receive salvation were finally separated from those who were not to receive it, God never regarded faith, but followed only His libitum (pleasure) or an "unknown rule" in choosing from among the whole mass of unbelieving sinners certain persons and ordaining them to salvation. Again Missouri tells us, in the act of election God regarded faith to such an extent that for this very reason, since He did not foresee faith in so many of the called, He could not ordain them to salvation, although He most earnestly desired to do so. And then we are to believe that it is one and the same gracious will which ordains some to salvation without regarding faith, and refuses to ordain others to salvation because it does strictly regard faith and fails to find it. A fine theology, surely!

mercy," Mylius writes: "Who they are on whom God will have mercy is not to be explored by reasonings of human wisdom, nor to be estimated in opinions based on outward appearances, and least of all to be sought in the secret depths of the divine will; it must be learned from the Archives of the Word which God has spoken. This Word, however, directs us to Christ, in whom the richest abundance of divine grace and goodness are found; and these riches are offered to all that they may be embraced by true faith in the Mediator Christ. But since faith comes by hearing ('preaching') and is kindled by the operation of the Holy Spirit, it follows that the mercy of God is ready for the diligent hearers of the Word of God. . . . We must note that the apostle does not say election is of God 'willing,' but of God 'having mercy.' This is significant. If he had said, election is of God 'willing,' it might have appeared as if election were absolute. Then we would also have to teach a particular mercy of God.* For if some were to be lost because they were not chosen of God, one might think that God did not want to have mercy upon them. But now Paul does not say simply election is 'of God willing,' but of God having mercy. Hence election is qualified, and qualified in this way, as the apostle shows Eph. 1, 4: 'God has chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world.' This qualification which implies the mercy of God is not particular, but universal (for the grace of Christ is offered to all, and it is said of Him that He was given for the sins of all the world). But it does not follow that what is thus qualified (election) must now be likewise universal, and not particular" (limited to a few). "Election is not† an unchangeable and unconditional decree of God to save only a certain number and only certain individuals; but it is God's fatherly counsel and purpose to save all those who believe in

* As Missouri and Calvin do in fact, declaring that God asserts this as a right over against the fallen human race, and acts accordingly, to have mercy on whom He will have mercy, without "inquiring whether we have obeyed or not", simply because He so wills! Evidently this is an unconditional, particular will of mercy, a limited absolute will of grace, and Missouri adorns it with the beautiful word "predestination."

† This little word "not" makes the difference between Mylius and Missouri. Mylius has it in the first part of his sentence, where Missouri has no use for it, but prefers to put it into the second part: "Election is not the fatherly counsel and purpose to save all those who believe in Christ." Or do such trifles (! ?) produce merely a different shading in the style of doctrine?

Christ. It is established, therefore, that God would have not merely a few, but all to be saved, yet only in Christ, so that if some are lost, it is not the fault of the divine will (as though they were unconditionally excluded from salvation), but entirely their own fault. Still this remains unchanged, only those are called the elect who receive salvation, not as though they alone had been objects of God's mercy, but because the rest did not accommodate themselves to the counsel and qualification of election (quia electionis consilio et determinationi caeteri sese non attemperaverint*)

In 1606 the Reformed of the Palatinate issued a "Hearty Admonition from the Church of the Palatinate to the Other Evangelical Churches of Germany." In this they attempted to adorn the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination with the most beautiful coloring, as though its sole object were to ascribe everything only to the grace of God. Since the Lutherans meant to do the same thing in their doctrine, the controversy on this subject, they supposed, might be "closed and ended." In 1607 Mylius published a small writing: "The Brotherhood of Evangelical Churches," and in this treats briefly of the difference regarding predestination. Among other things he writes: "If you of the Palatinate desire to know how both parties may attain unity and peace, then state the matter as follows: 'Whom He did predestinate, them He also called; whom He called, them He also justified; whom He justified, them He also glorified,' so writes Paul, Rom. 8. Here one thing always depends on the other, and one is linked into the other, in such order that one is always regulated according to the other. Now no one is justified without faith; by our present faith righteousness is now embraced. And through our faith we reach eternal glory, but only when this faith perseveres to the end. Hence predestination also cannot but depend upon faith, which indeed is found in the elect in

* Well, now — if one were to take the standpoint of Missouri — his hairs would surely stand on end at sight of this coarse synergism on the part of a theologian of the F. C. like Mylius! As though a person could really "accommodate himself to the counsel and qualification of election", so that he too would have been chosen, and thus would have decided and caused his eternal election by his "accommodating himself", by his adapting himself! Perhaps Mylius imagined that this was the case even with the elect, and that in this sense "our gracious election is promised us in mere words and sealed in the sacraments", as the F. C. declares! !

time, yet God must have foreseen it in eternity, and must have resolved to bestow it. But that you of the Palatinate have hitherto maintained a decree in predestination which depends on no order of faith, but solely on the mere pleasure of God, is folly, and you must henceforth abandon it, and rid yourselves of the idle notion" (p. 95). Fiat applicatio!

STEPHEN GERLACH.

Stephen Gerlach,* in a dissertation written before the controversy with Huber began, and directed against the Calvinists, set forth at full length the doctrine, that election took place "in Christ," as well as "through faith" ("not without regard to faith"). In 1598 and 1599 Gerlach again treated this doctrine in 3 longer dissertations "directed against Huberianism" (Vol. Disp. p. 656-889). From these we quote the following expositions of the doctrine of election through faith, which Missouri, of course, will again deride as "rationalizing."

"As election unto life did not take place without Christ, the Mediator and Reconciler, so also it did not take place without the consideration of faith in Him, for through Him alone man in his sin and damning guilt could be ordained and predestinated unto salvation without infringing upon the divine righteousness. And as God does not save man without faith, so also He did not deem that He would save him, or elect him unto life, without faith. This would have been contradictory to the divine righteousness. Therefore Paul writes, 2 Thess. 2, 13: 'God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation in sanctification of the

* Born 1546; on his mother's side a relative of John Brenz, under whose guardianship he attended the schools at Stuttgart when a boy; since 1563 he studied at Tuebingen; in 1567 was made Dr. of Philosophy; studied theology for six years after this under Heerbrand, Schnepf, Andreæ, and Brenz; went in 1573 to Constantinople with the imperial legate David Ungnad von Sonneneck as the preacher of the embassy, attended the proceedings between the Wuertembergers and the Greek Patriarchs, which brought about the Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession and of the Compendium of Heerbrand; since 1578 professor at Tuebingen; in 1579 made Dr. of Theology on the same day with G. Mylius; died 1612. He signed the F. C. in 1578 when he began teaching theology. As stated in the "Introductory Remarks" above, a dissertation by Gerlach first caused Huber to begin his foolish contention against the particular election of believers.

spirit and in belief of the truth.' In this article the following propositions of Huber are rejected as contradicting the Word of God and the Book of Concord: 1) That 'God in eternity chose and ordained all men in Christ unto salvation, prior and without any regard to faith'; 2) That 'beside this universal election there is no other on the part of God.' Here we meet a double error of Huber, which dare not be tolerated in the Church: 1) He invents a universal election contradicting directly according to his own admission, the particular election through which alone God determined to choose and save believers. Such a universal election (destroying particular election as taught in the Word of God and set forth in the Book of Concord) is found nowhere in the Holy Scriptures, and must therefore be rejected by the orthodox and prohibited in our schools. 2) The second error* is that he excludes regard to faith and the consideration of faith from the act of election itself, and declares, this election is concluded through the mercy of God and merit of Christ alone. For he asserts, God chose all men unto life in Christ, predestinated them unto sonship, and declared salvation to be theirs, without taking regard to faith. But this is false and godless, because it contradicts the will and righteousness of God to teach that God absolutely and unconditionally, without regard to faith, simply for the sake of Christ, ordained unto life man,† who is a sinner and enemy of God and a child of wrath and damnation." (P. 679.)

"As this proposition: 'God predestinated all men unto sonship without regard to faith, i. e. that they should become God's children,' is false, since God gave power only to those who believe to become the children of God, John 1, 12, so also it can never be proved that God chose all men in Christ unto life, or which is the same, that He determined to give life to all without taking faith into consideration. Therefore we condemn this proposition of Huber as false and absurd in theology, yea as

* Now open your ears, ye foes of "election through faith"! Note well what Stephen Gerlach, this faithful and zealous defender of the theology and Church of the F. C. states as Huber's second error, which "dare not be tolerated in the Church", and is contradictory both to the Scriptures and to the Book of Concord. What do you say? — this second error is a photograph of your own doctrine and "position", condemned by Gerlach! !

† This means "any man", whether with Huber we refer it to all, or with Missouri and Calvin only to a few. For it is not the extent, but the contents of this idea of election which renders it "godless" according to Gerlach.

blasphemous in contradicting God's righteousness; and together with it the following sentences: 1) That faith, or regard to faith (for of this we are speaking) does not belong to the act of election itself, but to its application, use, effect and purpose; 2) That the act of eternal election is completed through God's mercy and Christ's merit" (absolvatur, really meaning to bring to an end, to finish or complete), "and does not for its completion require faith; 3) That it is Pelagian to teach a consideration of faith as required in the act of election.* These three assertions Huber makes in common with the Calvinists, and by them defends the godless doctrine of the Calvinists, whose strong enemy he claims to be, and seeks to win other excellent men in the Church, against their own real conviction, for the Calvinists.†

Moreover, election unto life was an act of God taking in at one sweep both the object to be attained and the means for its attainment; it did not ordain the object without the means (among which is also faith), or decree salvation to any one without considering faith. It was never God's purpose, counsel, or pleasure to save men without faith in Christ; He resolved to grant salvation to men through faith. Faith belongs to this complete act, so that no one was ordained unto life without the consideration of faith. And as in the work of justification and glorification

* Huber taught that God chose and ordained to salvation, and hence also unto faith ,all men simply on account of His mercy and Christ's merit (excluding faith as a means of appropriation). Missouri teaches exactly the same thing in regard to "some certain persons"! A man must be utterly blind or hardened not to see that Gerlach here decidedly rejects what Missouri imagines is taught in the F. C., and that vice versa Missouri rejects what Gerlach finds in the F. C.

† Dr Walther also appealed to the fact that Huber accused even men like Hunnius and Leyser and others of Calvinism; and that therefore it is by no means strange that Missouri to-day is called upon to suffer the same slander as these "orthodox theologians." But this beautiful appeal hides "an open piece of deception"! Huber indeed wronged these "orthodox theologians", whose services for the Church and for God were many, when he decried their doctrine of the particular election of believers as such, calling it Calvinism, and placing it in the same line with the Calvinistic alsolute election of sinners as such (*a*) unto salvation and (*b*) unto faith. What Missouri to-day proclaims as the only correct scriptural and confessional idea of election Huber himself, in its essential contents (only not in extension), held in common with these very Calvinists. Whereas our "orthodox theologians" over against Huber as well as the Calvinists at that time rejected and opposed this at present Missourian idea of election most decidedly.

nothing whatever is detracted by faith from the praise of God's grace and of Christ's merit as the efficient and meritorious causes, so also in the work of election when God decided and resolved to justify and save sinners through faith. And as man is not justified and saved on account of faith, but through faith, so also we are chosen, ordained, and predestinated unto life not on account of faith, but only on account of Christ, yet not without the consideration of faith, without which the election and predestination of sinful men unto life did not take place. For election was not absolute, but according to an order and limited by faith. Huber, however, thinking that the act of election in itself took place and was finished, not indeed without Christ, yet without the qualification of faith, sets up an absolute election in Christ, by which Christ is said to have predestinated all men unto life without considering faith.* Some, accordingly, have drawn the conclusion from this, that as a few, such as are included in the act, are necessarily saved according to the Calvinistic idea of election, so according to Huber's election all men would necessarily have to be saved. For whatever God wills to take place without any limitation in Christ or for the sake of Christ, and without regard to faith, must necessarily take place, according to the passage, Is. 14, 27: 'The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it?' But the orthodox Church knows nothing of this election of Huber, the act of which is completed through God's mercy and Christ's merit, without the consideration of faith, and by which the election of believers as taught in God's Word and in the Book of Concord is subverted." (P. 683.†)

* Here again the similarity between the Missourian idea of election and that of Huber appears clearly; there is only the difference of extent, and in this respect Huber's error is more bearable than that of Missouri. For a particular election unto salvation without regard to faith grounded on Christ's merit, in reality makes Christ Himself and His merit particular.

† From the standpoint of Missouri this beats everything. Did Stephen Gerlach dare to write this out into the world, in the midst of the Lutheran Church, which had adopted the F. C. only a few years before? ! Can a man who subscribed the F. C. on its appearance write in such wise? ! Dare he publicly declare: "The orthodox Church knows nothing of an election the act of which is complete through God's mercy and Christ's merit, without the consideration of faith"? ! And people like Jacob Heerbrand and Luke Osiander stand by in Stuttgart and Tuebingen, and do not at once place him under discipline for this public "deviation from the Scriptures and the Symbol"? And thousands of the original signers of the F. C. still live in all the land of Germany, and not one rises to repel

"As the grace of God and salvation is bestowed upon no one in time for the sake of Christ, except upon believers, of whom alone Paul declares, Rom. 6, that they are not under the Law, but under grace, so also in eternity, according to the purpose and pleasure of the subsequent will, grace was given or predestinated to no one except those who believe and obey the Word of grace. And as these alone, according to the Scriptures, are in fact and in deed received of God unto grace (for upon those who do not believe the wrath of God abides, John 3), freed from their sins, justified or regarded as just through faith, and saved, so also in God's eternal counsel His grace was decreed as belonging unto these believers alone. God's grace indeed dawned like the morning sun upon all men through the appearance of the Savior Jesus Christ, and was revealed to all, Tit. 2; but by faith alone we have access to this grace, Rom. 5. God wants to save all men through the regular means, to which belong knowledge of the truth and faith; but He does not bestow salvation upon all for the sake of Christ, because all do not believe in Christ. For He will save those only who believe, 1 Cor. 1, and give to them only eternal life, John 6, and leave those who do not believe unto wrath and damnation, John 3" (p. 726).

Gerlach cites this point as one of Huber's perversions of the orthodox doctrine: "That we, according to God's ordering (which we are said to imagine), place election after faith, and thus invent a faith which has no Word, no foundation, no promise to rest upon." Gerlach replies: "Our doctrine is this: It is God's eternal counsel, purpose, and decree to save men through faith in Christ. Those now who believe the Word of the Gospel are included in His grace, and in the purpose and decree of eternal election. And God from eternity knew who would believe the Word of truth, obey the divine decree, and be obedient children. These from eternity He predestinated that they should be in the likeness of His Son, i. e. partakers of His suffering and of His glory" (p. 785*).

---

this Pelagianizing, yea rationalizing definition of election? O wretched Lutheran Church! From the standpoint of Missouri, all these hosts of subscribers to thy renowned Formula of Concord — what colossal asses and cowards they must have been! "Let there be light"!

* It appears that Gerlach too, viewed from Missouri's position, "does not go deep" — as Dr. Walther once said significantly of Leyser's sermons. Years ago the Missouri Synod itself "did not go deep" in this doc-

In his Commentary on Ephesians, which is quoted in the Acta Huberiana as having been written before the outbreak of the Huber controversy, Gerlach writes on Eph. 1: "God has established the office of the Word, that all the world and all creatures under heaven should know the Gospel regarding His good pleasure to save all men through His beloved Son, whom they should hear and accept by faith. And it is God's will that all may obey this Word and believe it. He also commanded to baptize all nations, that the will and grace of God might be sealed unto them, according to which all men are to be saved through the knowledge of the truth and faith in Christ. Since God, however, saw that not all would obey His Word, He predestinated those who would believe in Christ the Savior in an especial manner unto salvation, and the disobedient unto damnation. And this eternal will of His He commanded to reveal and preach unto all creatures, Mark 16, saying: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.' This was the special decree of predestination,* from the description of which the consideration of faith and regard to it can in no way be excluded. For as election did not take place without regard to Christ, so also it did not take place without the consideration of faith, by which we embrace Christ and the grace of election, and without which Christ, in whom is the salvation of all men, would be of no benefit to us."

---

trine, but halted cautiously where it had a solid foundation in the Scriptures and a clear Word of God to stand on. Later on a beginning was made in going somewhat deeper, and some risky maneuvers were even attempted in this line, yet Huelsemann's definition was still held fast as being orthodox: "God chose those of whom He foresaw that they would not wilfully reject the grace of His call etc." Now, to be sure, Missouri has gone much deeper, and continues to go briskly forward into the bottomless depths of the Calvinistic absolute swamp — I meant to say: absolute decree. And it is not every man that has the ability of pulling himself out again by his own hair! And to have others instruct them? — will never do at all.

* But according to Missouri this is not at all the decree of predestination, but only a wretched "self-evident conclusion" from the universal Gospel as it lies clearly revealed before us.

DANIEL ARCULARIUS.

Daniel Arcularius:* "The question is asked, whether the decree of election was formed with the condition of faith, that is for the sake of foreseen faith. — Answer: Since the decree of election is not absolute, but qualified in a certain manner, and by a certain condition, no man of understanding will deny that the condition of faith is included in this decree. Eph. 1, 4. 5; 2 Thess. 2, 13. Nevertheless, we do not say that we are chosen for the sake of foreseen faith, but for the sake of Christ who is embraced by faith; just as we do not say that we are justified for the sake of faith, but for the sake of Christ who is embraced by faith; or (which amounts to the same thing) through faith in Christ. We do not make the decree of election dependent on faith as a cause lying in the free will of man and moving the will of God in election. On the contrary, because it pleased God to elect us only in Christ, and since Christ and faith here stand in mutual relation to each other, Christ as well as faith is included in the decree of election. Faith indeed is called in one respect the cause of election, and in another the result of election: a cause inasmuch as by it we are implanted into Christ, in whom we are chosen; a result, however, in regard to God, who in part elects and defines the decree of election by the condition of faith, and in part afterward carries out His decree. For God did not in electing form the decree so that it differs from the one He afterwards carries out. Now He carries it out in part by calling, in part by justifying, in part by glorifying the elect, Rom. 8, 30; and all this not without Christ as offered in the Word and Sacrament and accepted on our part by faith. All these elements — Christ, the work of the Word, faith — God took into consideration when He chose men (horum omnium jam tum in eligendis hominibus Deus habuit rationem). And how could God, without infringing upon His righteousness, have elected men stained with sin, absolutely without regard to the satisfaction to be rendered by His Son? Surely, just as little as He could justify us without this satisfaction. Furthermore, when we say that God elected those of whom He foreknew that they would believe in Christ,

* Already in 1576 he stood beside Æg. Hunnius, "the most warlike of all theologians in Hessia" (Heppe), as professor at Marburg and subscribed the F. C., together with Hunnius on the 14th of September, 1577. He died in 1596. The above testimony occurs in Disp. Marburg, II, 252.

we say this with the Scriptures in respect to ourselves, since the Scriptures connect God's foreknowledge (prognosis) with election,* Rom. 8, 29; 1 Peter 1, 1. 2. Otherwise when we speak in respect to God, who sees everything to come as already present, we more properly say that those are elected whom God knows as believing in Christ, whom He contemplates with pleasure, in His Son, as now already by faith implanted in Him."

"Predestination is not a certain secret decree, established in an unconditional and mere will of God, in which God, without considering any other causes or means, predestinated some unto life and others unto death, and determined to give to the former faith, and to leave the latter or even to confirm them in unbelief. On the contrary, predestination is a decree which is revealed in the Gospel, and includes both Christ and the promise of the Gospel and faith. Wherefore the apostle declares that we are chosen of God in Christ, Eph. 1. He is the Book of Life in which the elect are written, Ps. 69; Ex. 22. And in Rom. 8 the apostle writes: 'Whom He did predestinate, them He also called; whom He did call, them He also justified; whom He did justify, them He also glorified.' Therefore we must judge of election by the Gospel, which teaches that the cause of election, as well as of justification, is the free mercy of God, promised in Christ, and to be embraced on our part by faith. And although this faith is a gift of God, yet God kindles it in us, and also increases and nourishes it, through certain instruments and means, I mean through the office of the Word and the Sacraments. Hence it is our duty to follow the example of the Gentiles (Acts 13, 48), and hear and learn and meditate upon the doctrine of the Gospel, and not to cherish thoughts of security or of doubt, to say nothing of rejecting the Word of God and of persecuting it with slander, after the manner of the Jews. For further explanation of this doctrine see the theological locis communis of Philippus (Melanchthon†)."

---

* Conjungit. Arcularius, therefore, does not take Prognosis to mean the same as election, nor the former as constituting an act of the will, but only as God's foreknowledge of faith.

† The lectures on the Acts, from which this testimony is taken, were delivered by Arcularius in 1581 at Marburg, where for sixteen years he labored by the side of Hunnius. Menzer, his successor in office, published these lectures twenty-five years later for the first time; later on they were also published by Fecht and by Feustking. Perhaps some of

JOHN GEORGE SIGWART.

John George Sigwart* writes: "In describing election we say, it is the eternal purpose of the divine will, by which God the Father, according to His mercy, for the sake of Christ's merit,

---

our readers will remember that Missouri also appeals to this Arcularius, because he too declares that faith "flowed from the eternal predestination of God as from a fountain" (cf. Report of the West. Dist. '77, p. 44). The reason why Missouri does not quote more, and why it leaves out the entire brief exposition of this subject, our readers will surmise without our help. Arcularius states explicitly that faith "in one respect is the cause of election, and in another the result." In what respect would Missouri have admitted that faith also is a cause of election? In so far as the eternal gracious counsel of God establishes the entire order of salvation and, in conjunction with God's foreknowledge, culminates in the special decree bestowing salvation upon certain persons, predestination is indeed also the fountain and cause of faith, because logically it includes the entire institution of means, and constitutes the eternad source of all manifestations of grace in time. If there were no predestination, not even in the narrower and stricter sense, an irrevocable decree bestowing salvation on certain persons, then there would also be no redemption, no means of grace, and no faith. For if God had not wanted to, or had been unable to, predestinate certain men, according to His foresight, unto the actual attainment of salvation, He would certainly also never have redeemed men, to produce at best only temporary believers who would not be saved. In this sense the whole execution of the counsel of salvation in time flows from the special decree of fixed election unto salvation, as also from its intimate connection with the establishment of all means. The same counsel of love, which in its paternal compassion looks upon all humanity without any distinction, constitutes, from the point of view of divine prognosis (foreknowledge) predestination; and for this reason scarcely anything was heard for a long time in our Church of the "counsel of salvation" (Heilsrath) and "order of grace" (Gnadenordnung), the expressions used being predestination and election. That Acularius was no Missourian is easily demonstrated in other respects. He says for instance: "God earnestly desires to give faith to all, not with an unconditional will, but with a will qualified by this condition, that they follow the order He has established, i. e. use aright the instruments of faith." "We do not say that any unbelief whatever, or that wickedness which is common to all by reason of our depraved nature, is the cause why faith is not given to all; but the voluntary, coarse wickedness and unbelief brought on by man's own guilt and connected with stubbornness. For it is certain that there are degrees of wickedness and of unbelief also in the unregenerate."

* Was made Magister in 1578 at Tuebingen; together with Jacob Heerbrand, Luke Osiander, etc., he stood in the front ranks of Wuertemberg theologians; hence also co-author of the Acta Huberiana. His most important work is the Admonitio directed against Parei Irenicum. Died in 1618, in his 64th year.

predestinated unto eternal life those from among the fallen human race who, by the help of the Holy Spirit, and through the Word and Sacraments, believe in Christ the Mediator. But we reject the Calvinistic definition according to which God is said to have chosen some absolutely unto eternal life, without regard either to Christ's merit or to faith. . . . We also reject the other extreme, which in most respects is directly oposed to Calvinism and deviates too much to the right; the doctrine which makes no difference, teaching that God chose all men altogether unto life without regard to faith. In this way an absolute election is taught like that of the Calvinists, with only this difference, in the one case we have a particular absolute election, in the other a universal absolute election.* . . . It is no less an error, when particular election is rejected, which is based on the subsequent will, and according to which God is said to have chosen unto eternal life men not as they are by nature, but as believers. Such rejection would oppose the universal will to this particular election as though contradicting it; whereas the latter is only a subordinate part of the former." (Disp., p. 194.)

LUKE BACKMEISTER AND JACOB COLER (AND CHYTRÆUS).

In the year 1602 the "Revised Agenda, how Christian teaching, the administration of the Sacraments . . . are to be conducted in the Dukedom of Mecklenburg," was published. In all probability this was a revision of the earlier work composed by the elder John Freder. Not only Backmeister and Coler† aided in the revision, even Chytræus himself was one of the authors. In our copy of the year 1602 we find an old note in writing as follows: "Anno 1602, the 17th of June, at the diet at Stern-

* Our theologians throughout call election absolute when faith is excluded, even though Christ's merit remains. Such was Huber's doctrine, and Sigwart as well as others always call his election absolute.

† Luke Backmeister, born 1530; professor of theology at Rostock since 1562, by the side of Chytræus who entered as professor 1557; signed the F. C. in 1577. In age Backmeister and Chytræus were only six months apart. Chyræus died in 1600, Backmeister in 1608. B. was for a long time Superintendent of the church at Rostock. — Jacob Coler, born 1537; since 1564 pastor at different places; since 1575 professor at Frankfurt a. O.; in 1577 Praepositus in Berlin, where he signed the F. C.; since 1600 Superintendent of the Guestrow District in Mecklenburg, where he died in 1612.

berg, the estates extended their thanks for the publication of the new Agenda, and prayed that the opinion of other theologians might be obtained, and that the right of nomination and of the patronate, which belongs to the estates, might not be infringed upon. Whereupon His Grace declared that the Agenda had been diligently revised by D. Chytræo, and no one's rights were therein infringed upon." As all the Agendae of that day so also this Mecklenburg Revision contains articles on disputed doctrines. Among these especially is one written by Chytræus: "Concerning Eternal Predestination." The first 5-6 pages read as follows: "Concerning divine predestination, and the eternal election of the children of God, and the reprobation of the damned,* about which terrible and abominable controversy and error has arisen in our time, our preachers are to instruct our dear subjects simply and honestly from the Word of God. It is indeed true and certain that our merciful, gracious God, as far as His paternal will is concerned, would exclude no man from heaven and eternal life, but desires that all men may be saved; also, that God gave His beloved Son into death for the whole human race; also, that Christ died for sinners, and all men are sinners. Yet we are not to imagine anything concerning God's essence or will and eternal predestination with our human reason and with our own thoughts,† but must believe and hold firmly what God has revealed through His only begotten Son Jesus Christ through the Gospel. And this teaches us that God, in pure goodness and

---

* Note the contrast. Missouri claims that predestination has no "reverse side", no opposite decree of reprobation. Everybody sees that it is idiotic to speak of the selection of some from among a multitude, and to say that this selection has no non-election, no leaving of the rest, as its reverse side. This very leaving of the rest makes it a selection. The above testimony shows clearly how the Mecklenburg Church of the F. C., with Chytræus, the author of this article, at its head, placed reprobation beside predestination as its necessary reverse side. But of course the object of both was alike, not sinners as they are alike by nature. Predestination is the "eternal election of the children of God", and non-election is the "reprobation of the damned", or as we read at the end of the article: "the rejection of the godless." Since election is a selection, there must be a "separation of persons", so that when the act of election is finished the mass undivided at first becomes separated into elect and non-elect. And never do the Scriptures or the Confessions or the confessors say that the elect were in the act of election regarded simply and in the same sense as "godless" or as without faith, like the rest who are reprobate.

† Apparently directed against Huber.

mercy, for the sake of His Son Jesus Christ, chose before the foundation of the world, from the human race, an eternal church or acceptable people to be His children and heirs of eternal salvation, to the praise of His glorious grace, wherein He hath made us accepted in the Beloved, Eph. 1. This must first be carefully considered.*

"Thereupon, when thy heart inquireth whether thou also art elected unto eternal salvation, thou shalt abide firmly by this true and certain rule, repeated and confirmed many times by the Son of God Himself in His Word, that of a truth all men are elected as dear children of God and heirs of eternal salvation who accept with a true heart, in true repentance and conversion to God, the Gospel or promise of grace for Christ's sake, and believe firmly that they have forgiveness of sins without any merit or worthiness of their own, for the sake of Christ, and that they are accepted of God unto grace and the inheritance of eternal life, and persevere in such faith to the end. John 3: 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' Rev. 2: 'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.' Rev. 14: 'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth.' Thou shalt abide by this sure rule, and refrain from thoughts about God's will apart from His Word. For God Himself declared His will concerning our election unto eternal sal-

* "Why, here you can see" — a Missourian might say — "what this Mecklenburg Agenda understands by election: this that God chose from among the human race a church or an 'acceptable people', certain sinners therefore, lying by nature absolutely in the same depravity as the rest, unto His call, unto faith, etc.; chose them in preference to the rest (prae caeteris), and thus instituted among those equally without faith a gracious separation of persons into such as are to receive salvation and such as are not to receive it." But please, not so fast, my dear Missourian! Our old teachers do indeed teach the election of a church of the elect which alone will receive salvation, but they do not teach this election like Calvin and Missouri without the prior consideration of future faith; on the contrary, they teach that as the Scriptures show clearly, this election took place in, with, and under this very foresight of faith in Christ. John 17, 20: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word." John 10, 16: "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold" (meaning the foreknown believers among the Gentiles): "them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice." And for this reason the Mecklenburg Agenda lays stress in what follows on the fact, that the decree of election bestowing salvation was formed exactly according to the revealed rule: "He that believeth shall be saved."

vation in the promise of the Gospel, saying (John 6, 40): 'This is the will of the Father that sent me, that all who believe in the Son shall have everlasting life.' Now we are not to impute to God, who is not a false or double-tongued, but a truthful, constant, and righteous God, a contradictory will, as though He declares and promises one thing in His Word, and resolves secretly in His heart to do the very opposite. To all who fear His wrath and seek consolation in the Lord Christ, to one and all of them grace and salvation is offered and promised, as is declared, Matt. 11: 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy-laden, and I will give you rest.' Also: 'Whosoever calleth upon the name of the Lord shall be saved,' Rom. 10. For both proclamations of repentance and forgiveness of sins, or of punishment and of grace, are Universales, that is universal, Rom. 1 and 3: 'For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, for all have sinned. The righteousness of Jesus Christ, however, is by faith in Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.' Rom. 10: 'There is the same Lord over all rich unto all that call upon Him.'"

"Since now God's Son Himself declares that this is the will of our eternal God and Father, that all who believe in the Son shall have everlasting life, and that all who believe shall not perish, that therefore the promise of grace is offered to all men without their own merit, for the sake of the Lord Christ, thou shalt include thyself among these all, and shalt know that this is the highest and most serious command, that we should hear the Son of God and believe Him; as the eternal Father declares from heaven: 'Hear ye Him,' Matt. 17. And not to believe the Lord Christ and accept His grace is the greatest and worst of all sins. Ps. 2: 'Kiss the Son,' accept Him, 'lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little.' John 16: 'The Holy Ghost will reprove the world of sin,' of this sin, 'because they believe not on me.' And this also is the highest and the immutable command of God, that we believe the promise of the Lord Christ, which offers to all men alike grace and salvation."

"When now thy heart is troubled with thoughts concerning eternal election, do not gaze up into the secret decree of God to discover whether thou art enrolled in the list of those predestinated to salvation, but look upon Christ and upon what He promises in His Gospel promises, that all who believe in Him shall

have everlasting life. If now thou believest in Christ and dost not fall away before thy death, thou art and wilt remain among the number of the elect, no matter how weak at times thy faith may seem. But if thou dost not in this life turn thyself to Christ, or dost not persevere to the end, thou art rejected. John 3: 'He that believeth not is already judged.' Deut. 18: 'Whosoever will not hearken unto my words which He shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.' Hosea 13: 'Thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help.' Therefore the cause of the rejection and reprobation of the damned is not God's eternal purpose, but our own sins." (Page 114, etc.)

DAVID LOBECH.

David Lobech:* "When we say that we are chosen in Christ, we do not consider Christ merely as being God, for election belongs to the whole Trinity; nor do we regard Him merely as being man, for His human nature would have been too weak to effect our union with God; but we look upon Him as the divine and human Mediator and the bond through which we are united with God, and as the head, in whom all the blessings offered to us in time are collected. Hence it is clear that in this matter Christ must be considered not merely (in regard to the preparation of His merit, but also†) in regard to its appropriation by us. For our election took place on account of Christ's merit, and through Him and in Him it is consummated. Therefore the mention of Christ in election necessarily includes the notion of faith which embraces Christ, since God never determined to save men in the unknown, despised, and neglected Christ, but only in Christ as appropriated by faith. And as there is no other name

* Born in 1560; studied at Rostock under Chytræus, where he was made Magister in 1583 and in 1594 professor and Dr. of Theology by the side of Chytræus, who died in 1600. Lobech died in 1603, only 43 years of age. As a member of the theol. faculty he took part in the proceedings against Huber, which Chytræus himself directed. His doctrine of election is identical with that of Chytræus and Backmeister. Although he is not among the first signers of the F. C., he belongs entirely to this circle, and is justly looked upon as a representative of their doctrine, as also the contents of his exposition prove.

† The words placed in parenthesis are not in the text of our copy; but we conclude from the context that they were omitted by an error of the printer.

under heaven given among men whereby we may be saved, so also there is no other means whereby we may become reconciled to God and be chosen of Him. But we must not suppose that faith belongs to the decree of election as an efficient or working cause; it is included in this decree merely as an instrumental cause. For God has not chosen us in Christ unto sonship for the sake of foreseen faith or of its worthiness and excellence, but in view of faith and with the condition of faith (intuitu et conditione). For as in justification and the bestowal of salvation the cause moving God to justify and give us salvation is not faith in itself (ipsa per se fides), but Christ embraced in His merit by faith, so also God is not moved either by faith or by the foresight of faith to elect us; on the contrary, the foreknown cause which is of such exceeding worth that on account of it we were chosen, is none but the foreknown Christ alone. They, therefore, openly wrong us who imagine that we make faith a cause propter quam (for the sake of which), since they themselves know there is a great difference between 'through faith' and 'for the sake of faith.' The former is employed by Paul himself and designates the instrument, and is therefore used by us not only in the article of justification, but also in that of election as altogether orthodox. The latter expression is papistic and includes the idea of merit, and is for this reason rejected by us.* The object of election are those who embrace Christ by faith and persevere in faith to the

* It is interesting and characteristic as far as the question is concerned, whether Missouri "always had the same doctrine" of predestination, to note its change of front in regard to the expression: "Election through faith." In the year 1861 "Lehre und Wehre" began to bring "Theological Aphorisms", i. e. "sentences recurring again and again in the writings of theologians and containing in brief, terse expressions a whole sum of important truths" — "containing the analogy of faith" — "constituting a safe regulative for theological investigations" etc. (See "L. u. W.", '61, 4). In the very next number the following aphorism is given in regard to predestination: "Not on account of faith, but through faith we are chosen unto salvation." In the year 1872 Dr. Walther still appeals to the fact, that formerly he had stated this sentence as "the established axiom of Lutheran theology from our older dogmaticians" (see "L. u. W.", '72, 132 note), using this appeal now to prove that "Our (Missouri) Synod" had faithfully adhered to the real doctrine of the fathers and even emphasized it over against the foes of our Church. Yea, even in the Report of '77 Quenstedt's words are quoted as "the correct doctrine of predestination": "We are chosen not on account of, but through faith and in Him" (p. 84). But this same Walther declared at the Chicago Conference (Protocoll, p. 67): "Our opponents would like to insert faith

end of their lives. For as God rejects every non-believer and every one who does not persevere in faith, so He gives salvation to every believer and every one who persevers in faith; and as He elects the latter, so He rejects the former." (Synopsis doctrinae de Praedest, § 53-57.)

"When we teach, the foresight of faith is included in the decree of election, we do not mean that we are elected for the sake of faith, much less that faith in any way depends on our powers, but we only designate the means without which there is for God no justification of a sinner, and likewise no election or bestowal of salvation. Nor do we mean that faith is here to be valued in itself, but because of the nature of its object, namely Christ who is embraced, for whose sake we are both chosen unto life, and also justified. Nor is this our meaning, that faith actually precedes election; on the contrary, we consider faith as God in His eternal purpose resolved to bestow it through the regular means upon those who use these means aright; and in part also, as God in every single case foreknows, or sees in the now of eternity, who will in reality obtain faith through the use of the means and through the operation of the Holy Spirit. Hence, although election precedes faith, inasmuch as it is considered to have taken place in eternity, and faith, as given in time, is as it were subjoined to election, nevertheless inasmuch as God has all things, whether for us they be future or past, ever present before Him, and believers likewise — in so far election includes also faith. And thus we do not precede election with our faith; but God, inasmuch as by His foreknowledge He takes into consideration the entire order which He determined to follow in bestowing salvation, includes faith in the decree of election" (§ 78-80).

---

where causes are spoken of. If they would say: We are chosen through faith, it might be more acceptable (if thereby they would mean: inasmuch as God predestinated us to bring us unto faith and to keep us therein), although this too is not the language of the Church." Note then in the first place: What was only a short time before "the established axiom of Lutheran theology" and a shibboleth of orthodoxy is now no more "the language of the Church"! Secondly: To say that we are chosen through faith would "be more acceptable" only then, when we put into the words a meaning they never had nor can legitimately have: "inasmuch as God predestinated us to bring us unto faith and to keep us therein." But don't ever say a word here about Crypto-Calvinistic fox-theology! ! That would not do. And our Norwegian Missourians still claim to-day that Missouri teaches an election "through faith", and merely rejects an election "for the sake of faith"! — Woe unto you! woe unto you!

"When then it is asked, which is more correct, to say: God elected 'believers,' or to say, 'He elected those who will believe,' we answer: Both can be said in truth and with the correct meaning. For God does not see and understand by gradually learning or by making deductions, but sees and understands everything altogether at one glance and with one act of the intellect; and for Him who lives outside of time in eternity, there is nothing future, but everything always present; therefore, it is more really the believing than those who will believe (credituros), whom He predestinates unto salvation. And yet, when we turn to the act of believing, and consider those who by the use of the means and the work of the Holy Spirit will obtain faith, it is correct to say that God predestinated those who will believe. For those whom He from eternity foreknew as such who will believe in Christ, He in His mercy elected unto eternal life. Hence the Savior says, John 17, 20: 'Neither pray I for these (the apostles) alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word.' And in describing those who are predestinated unto salvation, Paul, 1 Tim. 1, 16, calls them mellontas pisteuein,* such as 'shall hereafter believe on Him.'" (§ 90, 91.)

JOHN WINCKELMANN.

John Winckelmann:† "Election unto eternal life took place in eternity according to the purpose and good pleasure of God, Rom. 8, 28; Eph. 1, 8. 9. 11; 2 Tim. 1, 9. This purpose includes

---

* According to Missouri's view the proper expression in 1 Tim. 1, 16. would be: proorismenous eis pistin, i. e. those who are predestined or foreordained unto faith. But Paul is satisfied to say mellontas: which should hereafter believe. The reverse of this is the word: "For all men have not faith" (Der Glaube ist nicht jedermannes Ding). The old Church therefore frequently called the elect simply the praesciti, the foreknown.

† Born 1551; studied at Marburg and was there made Magister in 1572. Later he attended other universities of southern Germany at the expense of the Landgrave William; was made Dr. of theology at Basel in 1581; court-preacher at Kassel in 1582; and professor at Marburg in 1592. According to Hutter's narrative of the life of Hunnius Winckelmann was professor together with Arcularius at Marburg already in 1576; these two, he tells us, after Hunnius was called to Marburg, soon induced him to return to Tuebingen to secure the Doctor's degree, which he also received on the same day with Polycarp Leyser, his most intimate friend, under Heerbrand and Andreæ.

all causes and means which God ordained for man's salvation. For 1) God determined in Himself that in His boundless mercy He would establish His Son as the Mediator and Redeemer for the human race, of which He foresaw that it would fall into sin and death. — 2) He determined that He would call mankind by His servants unto the marriage feast of His Son, i. e. unto the partaking of His blessings, and offer them these blessings through the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. For He revealed the mystery of His will, Eph. 1, 9. — 3) He determined that He would work and preserve the knowledge of Himself and faith through the hearing of the Word and the use of the Sacraments by the power of His Holy Spirit. — 4) That He would justify those believing in His Son, 5) sanctify them in love, 6) protect them against the devil and death, 7) preserve, by these same means, those who believe and pray, through His power, in faith unto the end, and finally glorify them. From this, on the other hand, it follows that He will leave and condemn the despisers of His Word, the blasphemous enemies of His Son, those who leave Christ and seek other ways for salvation, the recreant, etc., according to the word (1 Sam. 2, 30): 'They that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.' This is the Father's purpose, decree and good pleasure.* Those who hear God's call according to His purpose, believe in Christ, and by the grace of God persevere in faith till the end, are kata prognosin theou (according to the foreknowledge of God) elected unto eternal life. From which it follows, because all do not hear God's call, do not believe in Christ, and persevere in faith, all, according to the Scriptures, are not elected unto eternal life. God's purpose and good pleasure regarding our salvation is indeed for all men, because He wants all men to come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved, 1 Tim. 2, 4; because He has given Christ to be a Mediator and Redeemer for all together and for each and every one in particular, and Christ died according to God's counsel for every single person among men; and because He finally also proclaimed to the whole world the great blessing of His Son. But on account of the cause mentioned above not all, but only a few are elected." (Disp. Giess. 4, 38. Cf. 5, 239, where some points are added, and where God's fore-

* In this way Winckelmann understood the F. C., the eight points of which he here evidently reproduces. The especial act of election took place according to the universal counsel of salvation.

knowledge of believers is emphasized still more according to Rom. 8, 29, and where we read toward the end: "This entire order of the causes and means of salvation, through which God in Himself resolved to lead those He had thus foreknown (ita præcognitos) unto the final goal, i. e. unto glorification and salvation, the holy apostle summarized in the golden utterance, Rom. 8, 29. 30: 'Whom He did foreknow,'" etc.)

"The purpose of God and the grace of Christ is revealed to us by the appearance of Christ, and brought to light by the Gospel, just as this purpose was formed and this grace given in eternity. Thus Christ was known before the foundation of the world, but revealed in the last times; and God also promised before the time of the world the counsel and wisdom regarding our salvation which His apostles proclaimed. For He revealed the mystery of His will, which He had determined in Himself, according to His good pleasure. But He revealed to us in the Gospel that He would justify and save those believing in Christ. This then is the hidden purpose of the divine will which God had determined in Himself. We therefore hold to the theological aphorism: The causes of justification are at the same time causes of election. For the righteousness of God is revealed in the Gospel, Rom. 1, 17. But what is this righteousness? God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. If the righteousness of God is revealed by the Gospel, it follows that this righteousness was before its revelation hidden in God, and that this righteousness is the very purpose of God which He formed in regard to our salvation." (P. 259.)

"How then do we regard faith in election? We say, it belongs to the order of causes and means which God in His eternal purpose and counsel established in regard to the work of saving men. For He resolved and determined, that of His pure mercy and grace, and for the sake of Christ our Mediator and Redeemer, He would save men through faith, which He Himself would give and work through the preaching and hearing of the Word (which is the office of the Spirit) and through the power of the Holy Spirit. Those, therefore, who believe in Christ according to this counsel and purpose of God, are chosen of Him, are justified by Him, and finally glorified. Accordingly, faith is one of the links (unum) in this order of causes and means, whether you call it

an instrumental cause, or a means; it embraces the grace of God or Christ with all His merit, and God, as far as faith is concerned, sees nothing whatever in us, but only Christ as embraced by faith; and faith also sees nothing in us as being in us, but only Christ, the foundation of salvation, bestowed upon us by the boundless mercy of God, on which faith alone rests with confidence. This is shown by the Scripture: 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life,' John 3, 16; John 6, 40; 1 Tim. 2, 4; 1 Cor. 1. 21; 2 Thess. 2, 13. Here you have the love of God toward all men, the Son as the Redeemer of the world, faith in Christ, according to the will and good pleasure of God. You have election in true faith, and in all the Scriptures there is no other purpose of God according to which election took place. What He determined in His eternal counsel and good pleasure, that He revealed in the Gospel. Election took place according to God's foreknowledge, 1 Peter 1, 1. 2. 'Whom He did foresee, them He also did predestinate,' Rom. 8, 29. Either He foreknew, predestinated, called, justified non-believing men, or men believing in Christ. But He did not foreknow, etc., non-believers, for to these He will say: I never knew you, Matt. 7, 24. Therefore He foreknew men believing in Christ who love God. Of these the apostle speaks. We must hold fast that the causes of election are identical with those of purely merciful justification before God. But the causes of our justification are the grace and mercy of God, Christ the Redeemer, and faith in His blood, Rom. 3, 24. 25. Therefore, these are also the causes of our election" (p. 269).

In his "Repetition of the Chief Parts of Christian Doctrine," a small dogmatics, Winckelmann writes: "This will of God, calling all men unto the marriage feast of His Son, is a serious will, since our high and beneficent God is not capable of calling men outwardly, and still desiring inwardly that they may not come; which would be unworthy even of an honest man, to say nothing of the most holy God.* But that most men do not come is not

* This notion Missouri cherished for years, by confessing a doctrine in its organs "most decidedly", while rejecting it at heart as a "deviation from the Scriptures and the Symbol." It even goes so far as to impute to God a like procedure, for it tells us that God would have all who are now in faith imagine, and regard it as their right and even their duty to

God's fault, but their own, since they themselves turn their backs upon God and despise the grace offered in the Gospel.* 'How often would I have gathered thy children together,' says Christ, 'even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not,' which applies to all who reject the divine grace. When therefore the question of predestination or the election of God's children unto eternal life comes up, our (Luth.) Church explains the purpose, counsel, and good pleasure of God regarding the saving of men in the following summary way: God determined 1) to have mercy on the human race, whose fall He foreknew, through the intervention of His Son's substitution and assured satisfaction; 2) to free the world from its misery through the Son sent into the world; 3) to call men to partake of the benefits prepared by His Son; 4) to enlighten and convert those who come, through the Word and the Sacraments, and through the power of the Holy Spirit; 5) to justify those who believe; 6) to preserve those who are justified against the devil and the world, by the same means; 7) and finally to glorify them. All these are purely merciful gifts and blessings of God, in which no works or merits of men were considered. Those, therefore, who are called according to this purpose, and who come to the marriage feast, and perseveringly believe in Christ, are elected unto eternal life; while the rest, who reject this will of God, are eternally lost. This doctrine is based on the following passages of Scripture: Eph. 1, 4-6. 9. 11; 2 Tim. 1, 9; 2 Thess. 2, 13. Note well, we claim that those who perseveringly believe in Christ are the elect children of God. For it occurs that those who are once justified lose again the grace of God by falling into errors and prevailing sin; yea, this happens even to such as belong to the elect according to the foreknowledge of God (præcognitio), who, however, when reminded of their fall, repent and receive salvation, of whom David is an example. He commit-

---

believe, on the basis of His promise, that they really belong to the elect, although He knows that election has nothing at all to do with temporary believers.

* According to Missouri's doctrine concerning "the hidden God" He "could have removed" their resistance "just as easily" as He removed it in the rest; but He deals — with those resisting alike — "according to His sovereign right to have mercy on whom He will have mercy, and to harden whom He will harden"! Whose fault then is it when the non-elect remain in their resistance? !

ted adultery and murder and yielded against his conscience to these terrible sins; but when the prophet Nathan admonished and rebuked him, he repented" (p. 25-28).

"God in His righteousness could never think of receiving fallen men in mercy, without at the same time thinking of atonement for their sins and cancellation of the same. And just as God in justification, which is the execution of election, justifies no one save those who believe in Christ, so He also resolves to elect to eternal life no one save those who believe in Christ, since no one can please God without faith, Heb. 11. . . . As in our purely merciful justification faith is required, which comes by preaching, so faith, which comes by preaching, is also included in the decree of election. And that is why Peter here (1 Peter 1, 1. 2) qualifies election by the Prognosis (foreknowledge, præcognitio) of God the Father. For of whom God the Father foreknew that they through the Word and Sacraments would believe in His Son Christ, those He elected according to His order unto eternal life. And this is the reason why election is particular, all do not through the Word believe in the Son; for salvation is of God, but destruction is of men, Hosea 13. How often would I have gathered thy children together, etc. Matt. 23. The mediate object of election, if regard is had to ourselves, is that we should be holy and blameless, Eph. 1; the final object eternal life. As regards God its object is the praise of His glorious grace." (Comment.)

"Christ is the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world. This universal grace is offered in the Word to all men. But why are not all chosen? Why do not all receive salvation? Because they despise the grace offered in the Word, revile it, refuse to repent, live on in sins against conscience, or fail to hold fast the sure hope unto the end, 2 Peter 2. This God sees, all things being ever present before Him, and therefore He does not from the beginning of the world write their names in the book of life. Do you ask now whether faith is in the power of man? — No, most certainly not, for it is God's work that we believe and persevere in faith. God bestows the gift of faith and of perseverance through the Word and the use of the Sacraments. 'Hear ye Him.' Who therefore does not hear the Son will not receive faith, but remain in unbelief; hence his damnation is just." (Comment. in Apoc. 17, 8.)

ADAM FRANCISCI.

Adam Francisci, another of our witnesses from among the original F. C. theologians, was the Abbot, i, e. Director, in 1580, of the preparatory school of theology, into which the Cistercian cloister Heilbronn had been converted, in the Margraviate of Brandenburg, whose capital at that time was Onolzbach (Onoldiæ, to-day Anspach). Francisci's testimony will interest Bavarian Lutherans especially, for what was then the March of Brandenburg now constitutes essentially Upper, Middle, and Lower Franconia in Bavaria. As appears from the preface of his Margarita Theologiæ, to which we are indebted for this testimony, Francisci had been in the service of the Margrave George Frederick, whose father George was one of the confessors at Augsburg, already for 18 years when the F. C. was adopted. In the official record of the original signers of the F. C. in the Margraviate Francisci's name appears at the head of the list with the letters "M. S." (Senior Ministerii), which as a rule showed that the person concerned held the highest ecclesiastical offices and was regarded as the leader among the clerics of his province. The Margarita is a compend of Theology, in the form of questions and answers, composed by Francisci at the request of the Margrave and published in 1592. The little volume was to be compiled from "orthodox writings," acknowledged to be such, and was meant for use as a text-book for higher schools, and as an Examinatorium in the examination of candidates for the ministry. Francisci states in the preface that he has followed closely the Augsburg Confession, and the Formula of Concord. "And I have faithfully and accurately retained," he writes, "not merely the substance, but also the language and forms of expression which recur frequently in the writings referred to, so that it may appear to all that the churches and schools of this region are not bringing out a new kind of doctrine (novum doctrinæ genus)." The article on predestination evidently follows closely the 11th Article of the F. C., yet shows clearly what we have already seen so fully in the foregoing testimonies from the theologians of the F. C.: either Missouri has now discovered the true meaning of the F. C. in regard to the relation of election to faith, and then all these theologians of the F. C. had already deviated from the Confession; or these theologians of the time and Church of the F. C. had the correct understanding of the Symbol, and

then Missouri is groping wofully in the dark! But let us hear Francisci's doctrine.

Question: "What is God's predestination or election?"*— Answer: "It is the purpose of the divine will, or the eternal decree in which God from infinite mercy, before the foundation of the world, chose from among the human race, in His Son, and for the sake of His Son, revealed in the promise of grace, unto salvation and eternal life, all those who believe in the Son and persevere in the knowledge of the Son and in faith, that they should be holy and blameless before Him and praise His infinite grace and goodness to all eternity, Eph. 1, 4."

"Is God's predestination or election the cause of the salvation of the elect? — Certainly. For it procures the salvation of the elect, to whom alone it pertains, and orders everything belonging thereto. And upon this predestination or election of God the salvation of the elect is so surely founded that not even the gates of hell shall prevail against it, Matt. 16, 18. And Paul writes: 'I am persuaded that nothing can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord, Rom. 8, 38."†

"Where must we seek the true doctrine of God's predesti-

---

* Do not fail to note this definition of election placed by Francisci at the head of his whole exposition. It throws a clear light upon all that follows.

† In this very question and answer, which might tempt St. Louis to adopt Francisci as their "brother in the faith", it appears clearly that the original F. C. theologians understood the words of the Confession, which declare 1) that predestination pertains only to the children of God, and 2) is a "cause of their salvation", in an entirely different sense from that put into them by Missouri to-day. Missouri's understanding is that election is "an entirely different thing" from the universal counsel of election, an entirely separate "decree", which 1) pertains only to some certain persons from among the mass of sinners as such, all lying in the very same unbelief and resistance (which "applying-only-to-these" already excludes the others); and which 2) differs from the universal counsel of election in this that it firmly decrees the salvation of these non-believing sinners, and "executes itself" in spite of every possible kind of resistance on the part of the elect. The F. C. theologians understood the word of the Confession in an entirely different way. According to their interpretation, predestination as the complete decree of salvation applies only to those as such who persevere in faith, who therefore are foreseen as believers; and this complete decree of salvation is the cause of the salvation of the elect, not inasmuch as it is contrary to the universal order of salvation, but by virtue of this order. Missouri, however, sneers at this as a "self-evident conclusion"!

nation or election? — Not in the Law, nor in our human reason, a knowledge of sin, and shows the wrath of God, frightening but only in the Gospel revealed to us by God's Son. For the Law condemns man, one like the other, because of sin, leads to men's hearts as with a lightning-flash, so that they sink into despair, if no consolation come to them from somewhere else. Human reason pictures God as a state-judge who according to his mere pleasure writes immutable laws in heaven that certain men shall be necessarily damned. The Gospel, however, is the revelation of divine predestination or election, because God revealed in it all His counsel concerning our salvation, through the Son (the logos, the Word), Acts 20, 27; John 1, 18. Therefore Paul teaches that the mystery of God's will is revealed in the Gospel, Rom. 16, 26; Eph. 1, 9; 3, 9; 2 Tim. 1, 10.*

"What is the doctrine (sententia) of the Gospel concerning God's predestination or election? — This doctrine of the Gospel is expressed in the following passages of Scripture: Ezek. 33, 11: 'As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live.' John 3, 16: 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He that believeth on Him is not condemned.' John 5, 24: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death into life.' John 6, 40: 'And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.'†

---

* Most assuredly, the "true doctrine" concerning the final decree of salvation is revealed in the Gospel as clearly as possible. Only by a nefarious denial of this revelation can a new "mystery" be set up here.

† But where, where — the Missourians must cry in amazement — is there one word concerning "predestination" in all these passages? ! Where is the word "chose" or "elect" in any of them? Not one of these passages treats of election. Why it is utterly outrageous (for one holding Missouri's standpoint and judging of Francisci's answer to the question according to this standpoint) indeed, utterly outrageous, to hear that these passages, which contain not a living word about "predestination", but speak only of the universal counsel of salvation, therefore about

"Is the decree of the Gospel concerning the salvation of the elect an absolute or a relative decree? — It is not at all an absolute decree, on the contrary it is relative. For it does not depend on the hidden will of God, which God wanted to be and to remain unknown to man in this life, but it depends simply on the will revealed in the Gospel and proclaimed in the Son, the Mediator and Redeemer of the human race. Hence it requires faith in the Son of God, and declares that those are heirs of eternal life who embrace the Son, the Mediator and Redeemer, by faith, and persevere in this faith till the end; according to the word, John 3, 36: 'He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life.' And Matt. 24, 13: 'He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.' "*

Francisci continues: "What is the cause of predestination or election unto eternal life? — We dare not seek one cause for justification, and another for election, but the same cause which is the cause of justification is also the cause of election; namely the undeserved mercy of God, the infinite goodness and unspeakable love of God toward the miserable human race,† which He would not permit to be lost entirely, since it was created to be the inheritance and property of His Son; as it is declared, John

---

"an entirely different thing", that these passages should express "the correct doctrine of the Gospel concerning predestination"! — But please remember, we would answer, Francisci does not wish to state the doctrine of Dr. Walther or of the Missouri Synod, but of the "Gospel." The F. C. itself tells us that election "is revealed in the Gospel", as all men are to hear it and seek their "election" in it. And so in the end neither Francisci, nor the F. C., nor any one else could bring more fitting passages than the above for the "election revealed in the Gospel."

* In these two respects then God's election is not absolute: 1) In respect to the Son as the Redeemer; 2) In respect to faith as the means of being united with Him. And this election which is not absolute nor regardless, but relative and with respect to certain things, Franscici finds expressed in the words: He that believeth in the Son hath life. How in the world does this F. C. theologian — even before the controversy with Huber — come to find the elective decree of salvation in passages which all treat of an "entirely different thing"? Think of the darkness — as compared with the light shining now— in which this poor man lived!

† So then God's universal will of grace is, according to Francisci, the "cause" of election, and not a particular "elective grace" which "applies only to a few", and therefore already excludes the rest, where God's mercy and Christ's merit nevertheless includes them.

3, 16: 'God so loved the world'; Eph. 1, 5: 'Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace.'"

"On what foundation does predestination or election unto eternal life rest? — Upon the Son of God alone, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator and Redeemer of the human race, who is the Book of Life into which all are inscribed who will obtain everlasting life, Ex. 23, 32; Rev. 21, 2.* And the whole number of those who are to receive salvation is elected in the Son of God and for the sake of the Son, according to the passage, Eph. 1, 4: He hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world. Furthermore, verse 6: He hath made us accepted in the Beloved."

Following these questions Francisci treats of the universality of Christ's merit and of the evangelical promise of grace, and then goes on: "How is the promise of grace in the Gospel to be embraced? — By true faith, which looks upon the Son of God, the Mediator, and appropriates His blessings for the individual. For by this faith each is to include himself in the universal promise of grace, and is to believe firmly that he is acceptable to God and chosen unto eternal life in the Son and for the sake of the Son, the Mediator.† For this reason the promise of grace correlatively (correlative) requires faith, according to the passage, John 3, 16: That whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

"Since it is certain that not all men will embrace the promise of grace by faith, does the promise for this reason become particular? — Although a large part of the human race remains in

---

* They are inscribed into this Book of Life either according to the universal will of grace: "Only these who are foreseen as believing in Christ shall obtain salvation through His merit"; or according to a particular will of grace: "Only these sinners as such, lying by nature in the same depravity as the rest, shall be elected *a*) unto salvation and therefore *b*) unto faith.

† As also Chemnitz, Selnecker, and Kirchner clearly state in the Apology of the Book of Concord: "We do not forget that all who truly repent are elected, and that all such are to conclude of a truth that they are chosen and are children of God, in and through Christ in whom they believe." Whether they all will remain such "chosen children of God" is a different question, about which we are not to trouble our thoughts in advance.

unbelief and wilfully rejects the promise of grace, as also the Son of God pictured therein, nevertheless the promise does not for this reason become particular, but is and remains universal, because it depends, not on the faith of men, but on the truth of God, which is sure and immovable, as we are told, Rom. 3, 34: Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar, Ps. 116, 11."

"Does election itself become particular on account of the unbelief of men? — Election becomes particular not in respect to God, but in respect to men.* For this particularity depends on men, who by their rejection of the promise of grace and by their despising the Son of God become for themselves a cause of destruction and damnation, as Hosea declares 13, 9: 'O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help.'

"Is this particularity of election in conflict with the universal promise? — It is not in conflict with the universal promise, on the contrary it agrees with it beautifully (optime cum ea congruit), since it is included and subordinated to the universal promise (siquidem ei inclusa est et subordinata.†) For the promise has its limitation, and must be referred to those who believe in the Son of God. Those who do not believe exclude themselves by their unbelief from the universal promise, and are lost by their

---

* "Fit particularis electio, non Dei, sed hominum respectu." What a cutting contrast to Missouri's doctrine! Missouri cannot emphasize and point out often and strong enough that in the "mystery" of election we come upon an insolvable contradiction in the gracious will of God, He, on the one hand, desiring all to be saved, and on the other hand (in predestination), not desiring all to be saved (according to the unrevealed decreeing will). Francisci teaches, according to God's gracious elective will election remains universal, and only becomes a particular act in respect to men.

† O Francisci! What will Missouri say when it hears this? — of you, such an exalted F. C. man? — and in a book written only a few years after the adoption of the F. C.? — a book which was to be used in the March of Brandenburg as the test of orthodoxy for candidates for the ministry? Indeed, what shall Missouri say when it finds all these F. C. theologians declaring that the decree regarding the bestowal of salvation is expressed in the words: "He that believeth in the Son hath eternal life"? ! Could all these F. C. theologians see and understand nothing at all, when Missouri finds the F. C. teaching as "clearly as the sun" that the decree of God choosing unto eternal life is "an altogether different thing" from this "self-evident conclusion" drawn from the universal will of grace: He that believes is saved?

own fault, according to the very solemn word, John 3, 35: 'The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth upon him,' John 3, 36."

"In what order (quo ordine) does God reveal His election and carry it out? — Paul shows the order clearly when he declares, Rom. 8, 30: 'Whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.' For God first revealed His will concerning man's salvation in the Gospel, and calls through the office of the proclaimed Word all men unto His church and unto the blessings of Jesus Christ, His Son, that they may earnestly repent and embrace the blessings of Christ in faith. Then also He operates through the Holy Spirit in those who hear the Word, enkindling true repentance and faith in them, and giving to those who believe forgiveness of sin, righteousness, and eternal life. Those believers, who are justified by faith, He also regenerates and renews through the Holy Spirit, and protects and governs them in their manifold weakness against the power of the devil and the world, so that they may continue in faith and a good conscience to the end. And finally, when they are raised from the dead, He will lead them into eternal life, and adorn them in the heavenly communion of the saints with unspeakable glory."*

POLYCARP LEYSER.

Polycarp Leyser (see the note above) did not merely sign the F. C. himself as Superintendent and professor at Wittenberg, but also labored at Wittenberg, Torgau, Herzberg, and Meissen to obtain the signatures of others, he having been appointed to visit these places for this purpose. He was besides the intimate friend both of Andreæ and of Chemnitz, and edited the posthumous writings of the latter (Loci, Fundamenta, etc.), and

* In this way Francisci also summarizes the eight points of the F. C. Universal redemption and the call of all men (of course, including also foreknown believers) is, according to Francisci, as also according to the F. C. itself, a part of the revelation and realization of predestination as God intended it for all men.

also continued the Gospel Harmony which Chemnitz had left unfinished. He died in 1610. Leyser was professor at Wittenberg beside Hunnius when Huber unpacked his doctrine of absolute universal election, and it even appears as though the first clash at Wittenberg occurred between him and Huber. He zealously took part in the controversy through writings and sermons. We quote from one of his writings against Huber as follows:

"According to His antecedent will God desires that all men may be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth, 1 Tim. 2. For this is the purpose for which God created man, for which He sent His Son into the world and redeemed the human race, yea, for which He ordered all the means of the Word and the Sacraments, that they might become partakers of such salvation. And if this will of God alone constituted election, we would soon be of one mind and agree with Huber, for in this antecedent will there is no error whatever, why all men should not be saved. But now more things belong to predestination, namely our repentance, faith, and perseverance;* and in the subsequent will, i. e. God's will considered as requiring also our obedience and submission to His Word, in this will (I say) the deficiency appears in men, that they do not attain the end for which God created them, that they fail to become partakers of His predestination, that instead of grace they receive temporal and eternal punishment, as by their works they deserved" (p. 23†).

"He who rightly looks at this order of God as revealed and founded in the Scriptures, and receives it into his heart, can understand very well, how indeed the means which God appointed for obtaining everlasting life are universal, so that no man is excluded by the secret, hidden counsel of God, and how nevertheless election and predestination remains particular" (i. e.

* That is according to the foreseen reality, not merely according to God's gracious intention.

† This distinction between the antecedent and the subsequent will of God Missouri ridicules with Huber as rationalizing and useless. It prefers to teach two gracious wills in God, each flatly contradicting the other; one universal, declaring: "I must first foresee your repentance, faith, and perseverance, before I firmly decree your salvation through Christ's merit"; the other a particular will of grace (also called "predestination" "Gnadenwahl") declaring: "I will first of all firmly elect and predestinate you ('this and that' non-believing sinner in Adam) unto salvation, and thereby also unto repentance, unto faith, and unto perseverance."

applying only to a few). "For God made this order for all men and declared in His Word that whosoever follows it shall be His chosen child. Now if all men would follow this order, as God in mercy desires that all should, then all would be saved, 1 Tim. 2, 4. But since the majority of men turn from this order of God, and since God does not wish to do something particular in the case of each, preferring to abide by His order of predestination as once revealed in the Word, all do not reach the goal and the treasure set before them, as the heavenly call in Christ Jesus bids them, and consequently all are not to be regarded as chosen children of God" (p. 48).

"The Scriptures declare in clear distinct words, God loved the whole world (and not only a few men) and gave His only begotten Son to it, John 3. Also, God wants all (and not only a few) men to be saved, 1 Tim. 2. Also, it is not God's will that any should perish, 2 Peter 3. But here we must be careful to note that God does not absolutely want all men to be saved, so that, do what they will, they shall not be damned. Who then could resist His will? It would follow then that all men would at last be saved. But He wants us to conduct ourselves according to the order prescribed. He who fails to do this is not saved, and God has not chosen him unto salvation."

"Hence we must understand this as the Scriptures explain it: God gave His Son to the whole world. Who now desires to enjoy Him must believe in Him, and thus will not perish, but have everlasting life. God desires that all men may receive help. But they must come to a knowledge of the truth. (1 Tim. 2.) God does not desire that any should be lost. But at the same time He wants every one to turn to repentance. (2 Pet. 3.) Who now does not believe, and despises the knowledge of the truth, and likewise does not repent, is of a truth no elect child of God, but is lost and goes to the devil; but the cause of this is not that a secret decree of God is to blame, preventing him from believing, repenting, and being converted; on the contrary, the blame is his own, because he did not conduct himself according to the order which God established for him as well as for others."*

* Note how Leyser emphasizes "the order." In one place he writes: "Some are so hardened, that they will not let the Holy Ghost operate in them, they resist Him, reject the Word, despise, blaspheme, persecute it, yea, harden their hearts when they hear it. These do not receive the grace of God, do not apply to themselves the decree of God unto life, but apply

"Therefore, we must consider God's order, according to which He would help us obtain salvation; and he who would be saved must follow this order. But that all may know what this rule and order of God is, according to which each must walk (Gal. 6) and direct his faith and life, if he would be regarded as an elect child of God, our Lord Christ has finely and simply set forth this order in one of His parables. It has been Christ's manner to take the difficult points of religion, which the simple should learn and remember as well as the learned and highly gifted, and put them into parables, so that by their guidance every one, even the most simple, might understand and remember, and as often as anything of such parables comes up, recall the doctrine taught. Now He has done the same thing with this article of His heavenly Father's predestination unto eternal life, and wants even the most highly learned to come down to such simplicity and abide therein, unless they wish to fall from the pure doctrine and sink into error."*

"In this way our Lord Christ sets forth the order of predestination unto life. When we wish to take up this subject, we must not let our thoughts flutter out into wide fields, as though God had absolutely and without condition predestinated some unto eternal life, and some certain men unto eternal damnation, and as though this would have to remain so in eternity, and could not be changed. On the contrary we must guide our thoughts as follows: 1) First, since God in eternity foresaw that the human race would fall through sin into death and destruction, He determined that He would have mercy upon it, renew His friendship with it, and prepare a marriage feast for His Son. In other words, He determined that at the appointed time His Son should assume human nature, and that in this way He would again betroth Himself in righteousness and in judgment and in lovingkindness and in mercies, Hosea 2. . . . 2) In the second

---

to themselves the decree unto death, and exclude themselves by their own wilfulness through disobedience from predestination, into which they could have come through faith.' So the F. C. theologian Leyser teaches! If now it is no synergism for the non-elect that "through faith they could have come into predestination", how can it be synergism to teach of the elect that through faith they did come into predestination? !

* And yet Dr. Walther could write in his notice of these sermons ("Lutheraner", '80, p. 80) that Leyser "intentionally did not go deeply into this mysterious doctrine"! ·

place, however, God did not want that merely the flesh and blood existing in the unity of the person of the Son of God should be saved, but that His Son should be sacrificed as the Lamb of God which bears the sins of the world (John 1), and that He should atone for the sins not merely of a few, but of the whole world, so that His blood might be the propitiation not only for our sins, but also for the sins of the whole world, 1 John 2. . . . 3) And God did not stop at this; but when everything was ready, He sent His servants out, and extends His invitation through the doctrine of the holy Gospel, and calls to the marriage of the Son not the angels, but men, and that without respect to persons, not the rich and mighty alone, but also the poor and humble; for His servants must go out upon the streets and compel to come in to the marriage feast whomever they find, the good, and the bad. For God wants to befriend the human race and unite Himself with it, that it may become flesh of Christ's flesh, and bone of His bone, so that He may not hate it, but love it, and nourish and cherish it as His own body, Eph. 5. . . . And that all the world might note, that God is not niggardly with regard to the salvation prepared by His Son, He sent out the messengers of His mouth, the holy apostles, into the whole wide world, and commanded them to preach the Gospel to every creature, Matt. 28; Mark 16. Their line also is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world, Ps. 19, that all flesh might see the Savior of God and thus be called to this heavenly marriage feast, Is. 40. . . . 4) Now when God thus calls men to the marriage and the kingdom of His Son, it is His will that we come, that we be present, that we eat and drink, i. e. that we hear the Word, use the Sacraments, and thus become partakers of the Lord Christ. For the Word and the Sacraments are the spiritual vessels in which the heavenly viands and drink of this spiritual feast are offered, that the inward man may be preserved unto eternal life. And God seriously desires that all men may come to the marriage; and He promises that, when we follow His heavenly call, hear the Word, and use the Sacraments according to the institution of the Lord Christ, He will operate through them and work faith in us, 1 Thess. 5."

"It is true indeed that faith is not for every man at his pleasure. Flesh and blood will not reveal it to us, if our heavenly Father does not, Matt. 16. For the natural man understandeth

not the things of the Spirit of God; he cannot comprehend them, 1 Cor. 2. The heavenly Father must draw us, if we are to come unto the Son, John 6. Yet He does not draw us by the hairs, or by force, but through His effective Word. For faith cometh by hearing the divine Word, Rom. 10; upon which hearing God has placed His blessing; that just as the rain and snow do not fall from heaven in vain, but moisten the earth, and make it fruitful that it gives seed to sow and bread to eat, so also His Word shall not fail of its fruit, but shall accomplish what God pleases, and shall prosper in the thing whereunto it is sent, Is. 55."

"5) Finally, our Lord and God demands that, when one once has come into the house of the heavenly marriage, he shall remain therein, and not run out again, and also be clothed in a wedding garment. In other words, he shall not fall from faith, shall not turn from the congregation of Christ unto the assembly of the godless, shall also show his faith in Christ by doing good works, shall put off the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of his mind, and put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness, Eph. 4."

"This is the order in which God has comprehended predestination, and they who would be regarded as God's elect children must follow and live according to it in all its points and clauses. And these things belong together in God's predestination; they dare not be separated, or some left out, but must be taken altogether, otherwise the doctrine of predestination will not be complete. And these parts have been stated and explained in the Christian Book of Concord, in the eleventh article, concerning the election and predestination of God."

"But they who do not follow this order of God, who either will not acknowledge, or who blaspheme the Son of God, sent as the Savior of the world, who persecute His servants, will not receive the doctrine of the Gospel, but despise it, will not come to the heavenly marriage feast, will not use the Sacraments, will not put off the old serpent skin, but wallow in all lusts and sins, for all such God will do nothing further, they do not belong to those predestinated unto life, they are not the elect of God, but Christ here declares that God considers them His enemies, that He will not only destroy them eternally as murderers, but will also destroy and burn their cities, and likewise bind the hypo-

crites' hands and feet to have them cast out into outer darkness. And God has determined in eternity that He would punish with eternal fire such godless despisers or malicious hypocrites, just as surely as He has surely ordained that all believers in Christ Jesus shall be eternally saved." (Two Christian Sermons on Eternal Predestination. Reprinted at St. Louis, Mo., 1880, p. 12, etc.)

"In the Holy Scriptures the Book of Life is extolled, in which the names of all those are recorded whom the Father in heaven in pure mercy chose (delegit) unto eternal life for Christ's sake, for whose sake alone as many as are received unto eternal salvation are numbered and accepted among the children of God. This Book of Life is really Christ Jesus, in whom He has chosen us before the foundation of the world, Eph. 1, 4. As many, therefore, as are in Christ have their names recorded in heaven. But the question is when and how this was done? We must, therefore, know that in a two-fold way one can be said to be inscribed in the Book of Life. In the first place it is done in eternity according to the eternal predestination and election of God before the foundation of the world. The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal: The Lord knoweth them that are His, 2 Tim. 2, 19. In the second place this inscribing takes place in time (temporaliter) according to the present grace of God. For when Christians yield themselves to the Lord Christ, are baptized in Him, believe in Him and confess their faith in Him, then they obtain through Baptism the heavenly right of citizenship and are inscribed into the Book of Life as such who are to receive salvation through Christ, if they persevere in faith to the end and overcome, Rev. 3, 5. This Book, therefore, is not an election of fate, in which some certain persons are chosen and entered through an eternal, immutable secret decree of God, so that it is impossible for their names to be erased no matter what their sin, or other names to be added for any reason whatever in this Album. For God explicitly declares, Ex. 32, 33: Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book. Therefore, as those who believe and are baptized are inscribed into this Book through faith in Christ and through His righteousness, so also the wicked blot themselves out of this Book of Life by falling away from faith and by other sins. It was necessary to state this, so that we may not seek our salvation outside of Christ's merit and out-

side of faith embracing this merit, in a certain secret fate, and in an absolute election of God, but that we may follow the guidance of God's Word, which points us to Christ, and wants us to hear Him in the Word, embrace Him in firm faith, and cling to Him constantly till the end. They who thus persevere, and work out their salvation with fear and trembling, will discover when at last the books are opened that their names will be read from the Book of Life as possessors of the heavenly inheritance. They who have fallen from Christ will be blotted out of the Book of the Living and will not be inscribed among the just, Ps. 69, 29. But they are blotted out and removed from the number of the elect, not according to a certain secret and absolute decree, but through their own wickedness. This is what Jeremiah declares, 17, 13: All that forsake thee shall be ashamed, and they that depart from me shall be written in the earth, because they have forsaken the Lord, the fountain of living waters. Yet, when such deserters are blotted from the Book of Life, God's eternal predestination and election is not thwarted. For from eternity He foresees and foreknows which will remain constant in faith, and which will fall away. And as He permits the latter to go their own ways, so He follows the former with especial grace, care, and favor, and keeps them in mind just as though their names were recorded in a special book.* And this especial care, this beneficence, and this mercy, which the Father in heaven cherishes toward believers for the sake of Christ, and which should fill us with joy, our Lord Jesus wished to indicate by using this expression: Your names are written in heaven." (Harmon. Evang. Cap. 104, p. 1112.)

SOLOMON GESNER.

Solomon Gesner (see note above) writes on Ps. 47, 4: "The cause of election is by no means to be sought in us, as though we had loved God and deserved by our faith and our works to be elected. The one cause of our election is the undeserved love

* Here it appears plainly how this F. C. theologian Leyser understood the expression in the Confession "in Gnaden bedacht", "remembered in grace", clementer praescivit (really: foreknown in grace). Not certain sinners as such, still lying with the rest in the same depravity, but only foreknown believers as such are objects of "especial grace, care, and favor" in predestination.

and affection of God, as the prophet here declares, God chose Israel whom He loved. As also God Himself declares, Mal. 1: Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated; and Christ, John 15: Ye have not chosen me; and the apostle, 1 John 4, 10, testifies the same" (Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins). "This will not serve to establish an absolute election of only a few men. God indeed chose us before the foundation of the world, when nothing of our works was present; yet He chose us in Christ as embraced by faith, Eph. 1. For through faith Christ dwells in our hearts, Eph. 3; and God loves no man so as to predestinate him unto eternal life, if Christ is not embraced by true faith, John 3; Heb. 11; Rom. 8." (Comment. in Ps. ad l. c.)

On the words of Paul, Rom. 9, 11: The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand,—Gesner writes in his Commentary on Gen. 25 (p. 508): "The apostle by no means excludes faith from the decree of election, nor does he define election as the absolute favor of God without the intervention of Christ's merit embraced by faith; this appears from the preceding eight chapters and from the following eleventh, as also from Eph. 1 and many other passages, to say nothing of the fact, that no one is predestinated unto eternal salvation in a different way from that in which he really attains it, which is not without faith, John 3 and 6; Mark 16.* In the same way Paul knows nothing of any other reprobation but that of non-believers, as he declares explicitly in regard to the reprobation of the Jews (Rom. 11), they were cut out through their unbelief, Ezek. 18 and 33; 2 Peter 3. Where then do these words belong, you ask: 'The children not having done any good or evil'? They must be referred to the fact, that works and merits are excluded from the act of justification and election. Yet, since faith is not our work, but God's John 6; Phil. 1, 6; 2, 13, and since, beside this, faith is not regarded in justification and election as a work of ours, but only as an instrument for embracing Christ's merit, it can in no way be removed by this passage of Paul which only excludes actions and works."†

---

* In the passages cited and in "many other passages" Gesner finds an election in view of Christ's merit "embraced by faith."

† Missouri, however, says on these words: "Neither good nor bad":

In his brief dogmatics (compendium doctrinae coelestis) Gesner in the 30th article treats of the doctrine of predestination, following like Francisci quite closely the line of thought in the F. C., and so to say paraphrasing the eleventh article, in the form of questions and answers. The F. C. takes it as a fundamental proposition in the Lutheran doctrine of election, that God did not "hold a mere review" (without regard to anything, without a rule) and pick out this one and that one, but that He regarded the order of salvation established for all men, and in exact agreement with its every word chose only those believing in Christ as children and heirs. Accordingly, Gesner, at the proper place, puts the following questions and gives the following answers: "Did our election take place through an absolute and naked will of God, without regard to any cause whatever, or did it take place through a certain qualified (certo determinatoque) counsel and decree of God?—Paul writes, Eph. 1, 4, 5, 9, 11, that we are chosen of God according to His good pleasure, which He hath purposed in Himself, and that we are predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will. From this it follows* that God did not by an absolute and simple (simplici) will choose certain persons from the human race, while the rest are damned by an absolute will, but that He employed (usum esse) a qualified (determinata, really: limited) counsel, purpose, and decree in the election of God's children unto eternal salvation."

"When did God form the decree and counsel of our election? — In the same passage, Eph. 1, 4, the apostle answers that God elected us before the foundation of the world. Election, therefore, did not take place in time, but was determined by God from all eternity, and preceded all our merits, as we are told, Rom. 9, 11: The children being not yet born, neither having done any

"His (Jacob's) faith especially, which he manifested in all his actions, the apostle excludes from the purpose, which God formed in advance."

* Note now what "follows" from this according to Gesner; for according to Missouri the very opposite follows in regard to the mystery of election: The "good pleasure" and the "purpose" are to apply only to certain persons. In regard to reprobation, however, Missouri wavers like a reed shaken hither and thither by the wind. At one time they confess most decidedly that the decree of reprobation is clearly revealed (He that believeth not shall be damned); at another they go "deeper" also in this and say, God could have saved the non-elect "just as easily", but here He is "a hidden God."

good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth."

"If election took place from eternity in God, before we were created and had done anything good, how then was it ordained not in an absolute and simple will of God?—There is indeed no cause of election outside of God in the creature or in man himself, as Paul declares, Rom. 9, 11: The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, etc. But it does not follow from this that it also had no cause in God, in regard to which this eternal decree of predestination was qualified and issued (determinatum et factum sit). Hence I take it that we must distinguish with Damascenus (lib. 1 orthod, fid. cap., 29) between the antecedent and the subsequent will of God."

"What do you call the antecedent will of God?—God's will is not called antecedent and subsequent in respect to time or to creatures; for in this respect all decrees of God would be antecedent, because they are eternal. God's will is said to be antecedent and subsequent in respect to the order within the divine mind. His will is antecedent, when He wills a thing without respect to any presupposed cause; viz. when He wills absolutely to create the world, to create man in His image, when He wills that man shall live eternally, for no other cause than ex sese, that He so wills, and from boundless goodness alone."

"What is the subsequent will?—When God wills and decrees a thing mediately, according to a certain order, inclusive of and qualified by certain causes; viz: when He wills that fallen men shall be saved through faith in Christ; when He elects us before the foundation of the world, but in Christ, Eph. 1, 4; when He wills to confine the impenitent by temporal and eternal punishments on account of the sins in which they persist."

After answering two questions in regard to God's permitting will with respect to sin, he procedes: Since election belongs to God's subsequent will, what is it subsequent to, or what are the causes and requisites it includes?—Paul in Rom. 8, 29, summarizes the whole order of eternal election: Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate; whom He did predestinate, them He also called; whom He called, them He also justified; whom He justified, them He also glorified. But the links of this heavenly chain may, according to the Scriptures and the analogy of faith, be divided into eight steps comprising the entire will and counsel

of God concerning the eternal predestination and salvation of man."*

Name them!—1) From eternity God determined to redeem fallen man through the Son who was to become incarnate.—2) It pleased God to offer the benefits of Christ to the whole human race through the Word and Sacraments.† — 3) He determined through the preaching and the hearing of the Word to enkindle, increase, and preserve faith in the hearts of men.—4) It pleased Him to justify those who by true faith accept Christ.—5) It is His eternal purpose to sanctify those in true love who are justified through faith.—6) He has determined in His eternal counsel that He will protect the justified in their manifold weakness against Satan's machinations.—7) It is His eternal decree, to strengthen the good work begun in them, and finally to complete it.—8) In conclusion, He has determined to save those who are thus called, justified, and kept by Him in faithfulness unto the end. Rom. 8, 30; 1 Tim. 4, 18."

"If election includes the vocation, justification, preservation, and glorification of believers which takes place in time, how can election itself be eternal?—A distinction must be made between the decree of predestination and its execution. The decree itself God from eternity formed in Himself according to the series (ea serie) just quoted from the revealed Word; its execution follows in time. Therefore, although we are regenerated and justified and received into eternal salvation through faith in Christ in time, all these things were included in God's counsel from eternity, that in time they might be realized."‡

---

* Note now the "eight steps" (gradus) into which Gesner, following the F. C., "divides" (resolvit) the eternal predestination of man, whether they contain anything but the universal counsel of God.

† The second point among the eight of the F. C., which Gesner here enumerates as the eight links in the chain of predestination, does not, as he explicitly states, refer only to the elect, as Missouri misinterprets the F. C., but to the whole human race and to the universal call.

‡ Mark two things here: 1) Gesner here also speaks explicitly of the election of "believers" as such, and "includes" vocation, justification, preservation, and glorification in this election; 2) and he explains this by saying that the decree of their election is the sum of all this "according to the series" he had adduced from the revealed Word in the preceding question — consequently, in, with, and under the universal counsel of salvation and its "eight steps" from redemption on up to glorification. Just as also the F. C. declares: "That in the way just stated He would

The questions that follow now treat of the universal will of grace, of universal redemption and vocation. It is noteworthy that the very first question again contains the antithesis: "Does God earnestly will to save all men, none excepted, or did He by an unconditional decree choose from the promiscuous human race some certain persons whom He will save?" According to Missouri the answer would have to be: Both is true, according as you speak on the one hand of the universal will of grace, and on the other of predestination, which "pertains only to some certain persons" and hovers as a mystery only over those, in short, constitutes a second, mysterious, particular will of grace. Gesner now quotes a large number of passages treating of God's universal mercy, and then declares: "These testimonies show that God by no means chose certain persons from the human race, but desires to have all men saved without a single exception." He, therefore, has no use for predestination as a second will of grace respecting sinners in the same depravity, from the start applying only to some certain persons, and constituting for these from the start a decree for their salvation without foregoing regard to faith.

Gesner afterwards continues: "If God wants to save all men, and if Christ also rendered satisfaction for the sinners of the whole world, does this not show that God too chose all men unto eternal life whether they believe or not?—This does not follow at all. On the contrary, (a) since justification, which takes place through faith, is included in the decree of eternal predestination (for whom He did predestinate, them He also justified, Rom. 8, 30), and since faith is not every man's possession, 2 Thess. 3, 2, therefore God did not choose all men without distinction, whether they believed or not, but it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save those that believe, 1 Cor. 1, 21. And besides,

---

bring them thereto." What the F. C. men at Wittenberg and Tuebingen meant by speaking of election as a "cause of our salvation", which "procures, helps, and promotes what pertains thereto", they themselves have told us clearly and explicitly. Those of Tuebingen say: "In what way election is called a cause of our salvation the Book of Concord states in the following words" — viz.: "that the entire doctrine concerning the purpose, counsel, will, and ordination of God pertaining to our redemption, call, righteousness, and salvation should be taken together." Those of Wittenberg (among them Gesner) say, faith is a result of predestination just "as Christ's suffering is a subsequent work originating in the predestination and ordination of God's children. For if God had formed no predestination, the suffering of God's Son would never have occurred."

(b) since we are chosen in Christ, Eph. 1, 4, and since no one is in Christ except he be planted in Him through faith, John 15, 7; Eph. 3, 15; Rom. 6, 3; Gal. 3, 27, therefore no man is chosen in Christ without faith. And finally, (c) since it is impossible to please God without faith, Heb. 11, 6, it is certain that God does not love those who are destitute of faith, so as to elect them unto eternal life."*

"Is there then a certain number of the elect and of those who are to receive salvation?—The expression 'a certain number' can be taken in a twofold sense: either absolutely as referring to certain persons, or conditionally as referring to believers. Speaking absolutely, we dare not claim a certain number of elect, as though God had chosen certain persons without any regard whatever to faith by His mere unconditional will, and as though He had limited this number by a sort of fate that it cannot be increased or decreased, as when from among 100 sheep 10, no more and no less, are absolutely separated. The universal and merciful will of God toward the whole human race is opposed† to this. Furthermore, the" universal "merit of Christ and the call and invitation of all men is opposed to it. And finally, we find this contradicted by the fact, that the number of the elect might have been increased, if those who are damned because of their unbelief had repented, as Christ asserts of the Tyrians, the Sidonians, and the Sodomites (Matt. 11, 21; Luke 10, 13), and Paul of the unbelieving Jews (Rom. 11, 23). And yet God from all eternity knows surely how great the number of believers is, and who and how many belong to the mass of the elect; as the Scriptures clearly state, 2 Tim. 2, 19: The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His. John 10, 14; Ps. 16."

---

* Poor Gesner! And so you too bring up such (according to Missouri's wisdom) "rationalizing" reasons to make the mystery of election "plausible to reason" by the explanation of faith in Christ? Where in all these Scripture passages is there a single word concerning the elective decree regarding the bestowal of salvation? My dear Gesner, take a course of instruction under Pieper and Stoeckhardt!

† Well, well, Gesner! Don't be a "rationalist"! Must you, a man of the F. C. Church, be taught by one like Prof Pieper, that God's gracious will toward fallen man is twofold, and that He therefore wills both: 1) to save all (hence also to decree their salvation, that is if they believe in Christ); and yet 2) to elect in reality only a few unto salvation and therefore also unto all means (also unto faith) without regard to their conduct? !

"God, however, loved us while we were yet His enemies (Rom. 5, 10), hence He elected us without regard (intuitu) to faith?—This is indeed true of God's universal love wherewith He loved the whole world so that He gave His only begotten Son, John 3, 16. But apart from this universal love it is a special love wherewith He embraces His dear children and believers and loves them in Christ as apprehended by faith; as Paul adds in the same place (Rom. 5, 9) that God loves much more those who are justified by faith, and as he declares, Eph. 1, 7: He hath made us accepted in the Beloved, in whom we have redemption through His blood, i. e. the forgiveness of sins. So also we read, John 3, 16: God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. John 6, 40; John 3, 36."

"Prove by clear reasons that faith is required in election.—There are two regular proof-passages (ordinariae sedes) for this doctrine of predestination: Rom. 8 and Eph. 1. In both places faith is required. For Paul declares, Eph. 1, that God chose the saints and faithful at Ephesus and blessed them with all spiritual blessings. But as the faithful are not without faith, so also the saints or those who are blessed, for Christ embraced by faith is our sanctification, 1 Cor. 1, and they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham, Gal. 3, 9. In the same way Paul states clearly, Rom. 8, 30, God predestinated those whom He justified; but there is no justification outside of faith in Christ, Rom. 3, 22; 4, 5. In addition we are told, 2 Thess. 2, 13, that God chose you in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth. In Tit. 1, 1, the elect are called such according to their faith."

"Did God elect us for the sake of faith?—As we are not justified and saved for the sake of the worthiness of faith, although we do not receive righteousness and eternal life except through faith, Heb. 11, 6; John 3, 36, so also we are not elected for the sake of or on account of faith. For although faith is included in the decree of election, it is not a meritorious cause of election, but only an instrumental cause, embracing the grace offered in Christ. As, therefore, righteousness is imputed to faith, Rom. 4, 5, so also in election salvation is imputed to faith and given gratis."

"Since Paul, Eph. 1, 4, declares that God chose us that we should be holy and without blame before Him, it follows that elec-

tion is a cause of our faith and of our holiness, and that therefore faith cannot be said to be a cause of election, but it must be said to follow election? — Faith is not at all a meritorious cause, for the sake of the worthiness of which we are chosen of God, 1 John 4, 10; John 15, 16; for who hath first given unto God, that it should be recompensed unto him again? Rom. 11, 35. Yet faith is the instrument which embraces Christ, and is in this respect included in the eternal decree of election. But when God carries out and realizes (in actum deducit) the counsel formed in eternity, then this decree is an efficient cause of faith in us. For whom He did predestinate, them He also called, Rom. 8, 30."*

"But since faith is in time, not in eternity, how can it be included in the eternal decree of God? — It is for this reason that Paul combines, Rom. 9, 29, foreknowledge and election: Whom He did foreknow, them He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son. For since everything future is present to God, the faith of the children of God could not be unknown to Him from eternity. God knows His own with an eternal and perfect knowledge, Ps. 139; 2 Tim. 2, 19; John 1, 48; Ps. 1, 6; 1 Cor. 4, 7. Nor did He ordain any one unto the inheritance of heavenly gifts by blind guess-work, and without knowing what He did, but by His most allwise and allholy counsel."

In his treatises on the Formula of Concord, 1595,† Gesner writes: "Election is an efficient cause of faith in so far as it includes the gracious will of God, the merit of Christ, the vocation and communication of the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, in so far as it includes faith in Christ, renewal, and perseverance, it is not the cause of faith, but rather a decree composed of the sum and inseparable union of several causes" (p. 502).

"Accordingly, the causes which precede the elective decree, not indeed in time, but according to the order, are: 1) the fore-

* For whom He did foreknow as coming unto faith through His universal grace, concerning them He determines that He will give them faith "in this way." Hence foreknowledge is so important here.

† We are not ourselves in possession of this work, so we quote the following testimonies of Gesner from the translation of Dr. S. Fritschel in his article "Dogmengeschichtliches ueber die Lehre vom Verhaeltnis des Glaubens zur Gnadenwahl" (Dogmatico-Historical Matter on the Doctrine concerning the Relation of Faith to Election) in "Kirchliche Zeitschrift", 1880, p. 135. This applies also to the testimonies from Mamphrasius.

knowledge of our misery; 2) the merit of Christ; 3) The appropriation of this merit through faith" (p. 616).

"The decree of predestination and election is, as far as the order of causes is concerned, not the first and foremost,* nor does it precede with God in the order of causes all other causes; on the contrary it presupposes as its basis: 1) the creation of man; 2) man's fall and misery; 3) Christ's merit; and 4) faith in Christ" (p. 624).

"I therefore readily admit that election precedes our sanctification as its cause, when we premise election as having taken place in eternity, and make the temporal execution of the eternal decree to follow it" (p. 629).

"But when the apostle declares, Eph. 1, that we are chosen in Christ, God must have had both before His eyes when He chose us: our misery, causing us to need a Redeemer, and faith by which we would embrace Christ's merit.† In this sense our sanctification (reference is had to that imputed to us) would not follow election, but would be comprehended in it and subordinated to it" (innexa et subjuncta, really: closely united to and joined with).

---

* As Missouri declares already in the Report of '77: "It is self-evident that this" (the election of certain persons unto salvation) "must be so to say the oldest, first and foremost blessing. For even the Son of God became man in time and redeemed us in time. Likewise we are called in time" etc. (p. 25).

† Missouri, however, is bound to exclude faith from the "in Christ" (Eph. 1, 4), and thereby exhibits clearly a deviation in principle not only from the F. C. men at the time of the F. C., but also from the Book of Concord itself, which explicitly explains "election in Christ" by saying that the Father "determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe in Him." Epit. § 12. Prof. Stoeckhardt for instance writes: "Does this" (in Christ) "mean that we are chosen in Christ? Many dogmaticians of the 17th century take it in this sense, and thereby support their assertion that God chose with regard to foreseen faith." (Stoeckhardt says nothing about the F. C. theologians of the 16th century intending to make it appear as though only "many dogmaticians of the 17th century" held this view!) And Dr. Walther himself writes: "It is indeed written: 'According as He hath chosen us through Him', or, to take the original text, en auto, 'in Him' (Eph. 1, 4); but where is it written: 'According as He hath chosen us as being in Him'? and who dares to foist these words of his own upon the Holy Ghost? and thus 'put Him to school', as though He did not know how to express what He wanted to reveal?" (What our Lutheran fathers are said to have done over against the Calvinists! To be sure, when Dr. Walther writes

WOLFGANG MAMPHRASIUS.

Wolfgang Mamphrasius* writes: "It is erroneous to suppose that faith depends on election as the effect upon its cause, and that election does not depend on faith; for it is true to say both. For only those who believe, that is believe till the end, are elect, and only the elect have such faith. But election does not depend on faith as its moving or its meritorious cause, but as its instrumental cause. We are chosen not for the sake of faith, but through faith, or rather through Christ and for the sake of Christ as He is appropriated by faith. On the other hand, faith depends on election in a double way: 1) When we look at God's eternal counsel and decree concerning election† we find faith included as an important element; 2) When we look at eternal predestination with respect to its execution which takes place afterwards in time, then indeed predestination is the first and efficient cause of faith, and faith depends on eternal election as the effect upon its cause."‡ (Erotemata in F. C., 1601, p. 458. Quoted in Kirchl. Zeitschrift," 1880, p. 136.)

---

in many instances: "Paul meant to say" etc., it is again "an entirely different thing"!) When Missouri, moreover, declares "in Christ", taken strictly, is equivalent to "for the sake of Christ", even this (if one does not agree with Winer, who says: "With names of persons 'en' is never taken in the sense of 'for the sake of' ") decides nothing for Missouri. We all agree that the elect are not chosen for their own sakes or for the sake of their own merit and worthiness, but only for the sake of Christ. But the question is: Did God for the sake of the unknown, unappropriated Christ elect and ordain a few sinners unto salvation and unto eternal life? or for the sake of the Mediator as embraced and accepted by faith? Here is the parting of the roads between the evangelical Lutheran and the Missourian Calvinistic doctrine of election. And just on this point the revealed Gospel has a strong word to say, John 3, 16.

* Born 1557; in 1592 co-author of the Saxon Articles of Visitation (together with Hunnius, Mylius, Mirus, and Loner); "he attended, on account of the Crypto-Calvinists, general and special visitations in Saxony and Silesia" (Joecher); died 1616. It is not impossible that he was one of the first signers of the F. C., although we cannot ascertain anything about it. He is at least one of the original defenders and apologetes of the F. C., and a witness to the faith regarding predestination then actually living in the Lutheran Church.

† Which counsel ordains all the causes and means of salvation.

‡ Mamphrasius here states the only two possibilities according to which the two so-called doctrinal types concerning the relation between election and faith can be harmonized without detriment to evangelical doctrine. The solution is the one we have recommended for years:

JOHN PAPPUS.

John Pappus:* "Predestination, really so called, is the eternal decree of God revealed in the Gospel to call, justify, and glorify all those who would believe in the Mediator Christ (Crediturus)

"elected unto salvation according to foreseen faith, and in so far also unto actual faith." God, to speak in a human way, foresaw which of the redeemed and called there would be to be saved through persevering faith, and beholding them determined to carry out in reality the counsel of salvation as comprehended in the eight points of the F. C. By this determination of God, embracing the foresight of the eventual outcome, only persevering believers are actually firmly elected and ordained both unto salvation and unto all means for its attainment, inasmuch as God decrees and "ordains that He will really bring them" (on the universal way of salvation "through His grace, gifts, and operation", as these are open for all) "unto salvation." In this way foreknowledge remains "the first step in the acts of God for the glorifying of His own", inasmuch as He foresaw, "qui essent salvandi", which would be savable.

* Born 1549; since 1570 professor at Strassburg; received the degree of Dr. in 1572 at Tuebingen under Jacob Andreæ; died 1610. For eleven years he held a professorship beside John Marbach, who "disputed at Wittenberg under the presidency of Lutheri and received the gradum doctoris theologiae" (Joecher), and had been a house and table companion of Luther at Wittenberg (De Wette, Luther's Letters, 5,343, where his testimonial from the faculty is given in full). Marbach and Pappus both labored assiduously for the adoption of the F. C. in Strassburg, whereas J. Sturm, who was inclined toward Calvinism, opposed it with all his strength, and succeeded in influencing the magistracy to such an extent that they declined the adoption. Andreæ accordingly wrote to Marbach: "What is the reason that your senate hesitates to further and confirm the godly and holy concord of our Church? For I cannot conceive that you would refuse subscription; I do not in the least doubt your hearty agreement." Plank (II, 646) reports: "Those of Zuerich by a special letter to the magistracy of Strassburg effected that the latter declined to subscribe the Formula. The theologians and preachers wanted to subscribe it on their own account" (as Hunnius and Arcularius had done in Marburg), "and this caused the contentions between the two parties which existed in the city already before this, to break out in quarrels, the fiery J. Pappus on the side of the orthodox, and the Rector of the University, J. Sturm, on the other side playing the chief parts." Hutter's Concordia Concors likewise furnishes ample proof for the fact that Marbach and Pappus were true F. C. men, who were prevented only by circumstances from officially signing the Formula. Already in 1578 Pappus issued a writing in defense of the F. C. on account of its rejection of Calvinism; and in 1580 and 1581 Pappus and Sturm exchanged several polemics on the F. C. In 1591 Pappus published his "Chief Articles of Christian Doctrine" according to the Augsb. Conf. and the F. C.

and would persevere (perseveraturis) in true faith to the end, that they should be holy and without blame before Him in love, to the praise of His glorious grace." (Disp. de Præd. th. 58.*)

ANDREW SCHAAFMANN.

Andrew Schaafmann:† "We have hitherto shown that Christ and His merit is a cause of our election, and that therefore our election does not depend on the absolute and simple pleasure of God. Now another point is raised, whether, since Christ benefits no one without faith, regard to faith also constitutes a part of our election. On this point Piscator explicitly takes the contrary side. Likewise Tossanus, on Pelagianism, th. 156. 157, Beza in his second Respons. ad Montisbel. p. 233, the Heidelbergers in the 'Golden Ladder,' Peter Martyr on Rom. 9. Others, however, hold the affirmative and prove by the strongest arguments that faith dare not be excluded from election or predestination. The papists mix in among these arguments faith as a quality and future works, or the foreseen good use of free

* It must be noted that Pappus does not say, with Calvin and Missouri, God chose (*a*) unto salvation by His secret purpose "some certain persons" from among the mass of sinners foreseen as lying without a difference all in the same depravity and resistance; and (*b*) that for this reason God also determined in time to call, justify, and glorify these sinners in Adam ordained unto salvation according to His free pleasure. No; the foreseen Credituri and Perseveraturi as such — i. e. inasmuch as God from eternity foresaw which of the called would through His grace come to faith and persevere in faith — God chose and ordained to this that He would bring them safely unto salvation by virtue and in the manner of the universal order of salvation (which they do not wilfully despise like the rest). This "first doctrinal type", to be sure, agrees beautifully with the Scriptures (Rom. 8, 29. 30.), with the Book of Concord (Declar. § 23) — and with the "second doctrinal type." Huelsemann's well-known definition (adopted by Scherzer and Rechenberg) is, for instance, rather a definition of election according to this first tpye of doctrine than according to the second. If Missouri would only hold to this orthodox first type, it could not attack as it does the Intuitu Fidei, and sweep out so completely the foresight of faith.

† According to Joecher he was stationed at Dortmund (Tremonia) in Westphalia at about 1590; he wrote two works in 1596 against the renowned Calvinist John Piscator, the one on the cause of sin, the other on predestination. He was personally acquainted with Hunnius and other Wittenbergers.

will, in such a way that they assert God was moved thereby in the act of predestination to choose these and no others. The Lutherans, however, maintain in substance and in words that God found nothing in man, neither good works, nor the good use of free will, yea not even faith itself, that thereby He should have been moved to choose or predestinate any one; on the contrary, Christ's merit is exclusively the ransom and price whose worthiness moved God to elect and predestinate us. But since Christ's merit benefits no one without faith, our theologians maintain and teach that Christ embraced or to be embraced according to His merit is the cause of election, and that therefore this universal merit as far as its fruit is concerned is limited by the condition of faith only to believers. Whether now this regard to faith or this foreseen faith is termed a condition of election, or a qualification, or a cause (i. e. as in justification), our theologians care little to dispute, if only faith is not excluded from the act of election. And if the question is raised, how faith which exists only in time can be either a cause or a qualification of eternal election, they answer, that election unto life took place according to foreknowledge, and that therefore it is not absurd to choose something future in predestination."

"Without faith it is impossible to please God. Heb. 11. Yet the elect please God; for if they did not please God, this great blessing would not be bestowed upon them by God. Consequently, they please God through faith."

"If the purpose of the divine will regarding the salvation of men includes Christ and faith, then election and predestination also include the two. The reason is, because election took place according to this purpose, Rom. 8, 28; Eph. 1, 11. But now it is a truth that the 'purpose' also included Christ and faith. John 6, 40: This is the will* of the Father, that whosoever seeth the Son and believeth on Him should have everlasting life. Cf. Eph. 1, 9. Consequently, election and predestination also include faith."

"If Christ in view of His merit is the cause of our election, He is such either absolutely or relatively, inasmuch as He is

* Missouri, of course, will raise its hands in horror and exclaim: "What terrible confusion! John 6, 40 speaks only of the will of God and contains no syllable about the purpose! These things are as different as heaven and earth! Beside the universal will of grace there stands without mediation the particular purpose of grace"!

embraced by faith and imputed to man. . . . But Christ in view of His merit is not absolutely and unconditionally the cause of our election. Several reasons are added for the sake of those who indeed include Christ in election, but tear out faith. The first reason is, it would follow that Christ benefits us nothing without faith. The second is, it would follow that all those are elected for whom Christ obtained His merit through His death, which would be absurd; or at least this would follow that every single person is sufficiently elected (sufficienter), as is believed (by the Reformed), Christ died sufficiently for all. . . . Since Christ is not simply (simpliciter) the cause of election, He will be a cause with respect to faith. And consequently faith dare not be altogether excluded from the act of election. Outside of Christ no one is elected. This Paul teaches Eph. 1, 4. Sinful men, however, without the consideration of faith, are outside of Christ, for which reason also they are not chosen without considering faith." (De Prædest. p. 249 sqq.)

PHILIP NICOLAI.

Philip Nicolai* writes: "Just as eternal, almighty God was stirred by the first light or foreknowledge of our miserable woe, in boundless mercy, unto gracious love of the whole human race, so also the second light or the foreknowledge of faith and unbelief moved Him to the decree of equity (called Voluntatem consequentum, subsequent will) regarding all children of men, decreeing and determining in His eternal counsel what would be and what shall be the final end of each and every one."

"This decree is, that all shall be saved who obediently follow the counsel of the Almighty and the ordained means of salvation by diligent hearing of the calling Word and use of the precious Sacraments, and thereby permit themselves to be enlightened, regenerated, and guided to the end by the Holy Spirit.

---

* Born 1556; in 1576 pastor at Mengeringhausen in the territory of Waldeck, afterwards at Unna in Westphalia, and since 1601 at Hamburg, where he died in 1608. He is known as the author of a number of our most beautiful hymns: "Wachet auf!" — "Wie schoen leucht't." A zealous friend of the F. C., which, however, as in adjacent Hessia, was not officially adopted, although "at the Synod of Mengeringhausen, A. 1593, we unanimously acknowledged and confessed the Christian Book of Concord" (Nicolai). His chief work is the incomparable "Freudenspiegel des ewigen Lebens" (Mirror of Delight of Eternal Life).

But they who despise the ordained means, lose them and remain in their sins and unbelief till death, abide under God's wrath, and eternal damnation comes upon them."

"As the clear passages of Scripture testify: God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He that believeth on Him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God, John 3. I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness. And if any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day, John 12. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him, John 3."

"From this counsel and Voluntate Consequente flows Prædestinatio or election unto eternal life, and also the decree of reprobation, which we must treat by itself."

"Predestination, the ordination and election unto eternal life, is an especial decree of grace and an eternal resolution, whereby God, before the foundation of the world, by His infallible eternal foreknowledge, predestined and ordained unto heavenly joy and eternal certain salvation all those who, from the beginning of the world till the present moment, were called through the established means of grace, justified in Christ, and finally glorified; as also all those who to-day and until the final judgment, shall likewise be called of God, justified, and glorified; that they all shall be and remain to all eternity co-heirs of Christ and of His unspeakable treasures of delight, and partakers of the heavenly glory, eternal pleasure, eternal honor, and eternal salvation, and that therefore also, when crosses and affliction come upon them here, all things shall work together for their good."

"This description is taken from the following words of St. Paul: We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom He

did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified, Rom. 8, 28-30."

"In these words predestination unto salvation is understood to extend, before the creation of the world, by virtue of divine foreknowledge, over all those who in time are called, justified, and glorified; i. e. over those who constantly follow God's universal will of grace, counsel of grace, and ordination of grace in Christ; abide by the established means of salvation; are called by the Gospel; are brought to repentance and awakened to faith by the gracious antecedent and subsequent operation of the Holy Spirit, through diligent hearing and consideration of the blessed divine Word, as also through the use of the precious Sacraments and through the cross that is added; are strengthened and kept that they embrace the righteousness of the Gospel in the blood of Christ, resist the old Adam, fight a good fight, keep the faith and a good conscience, remain patient beneath the cross, and faithful to the Savior Jesus Christ through the power of God unto death."

"For this reason everything in this mystery that God does and from eternity determined to do is altogether a work of grace. With our attendance at church, hearing of sermons, partaking of the Holy Supper, faith, hope, new obedience and good works we do not earn eternal predestination. Since faith, hope, new obedience, patience, etc., and also the blessed hearing and fruitful consideration of the Gospel, flow, without any merit or worthiness of ours, from the pure fatherly mercy of God and the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit, they are all a pure gift of the Almighty, and not at all dependent on our fleshly willing or running, but on God's compassion. For what hast thou (says the apostle) that thou didst not receive? Now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it? 1 Cor. 4."

"In mercy God elected us and established predestination before the foundation of the world not simply" (i. e. absolutely and unconditionally, without regard to anything), "but through Christ, Eph. 1, 4. But what is Christ for us children of men but a gift of grace and a present of grace from the pure grace and love of God? John 3, 16. Even when God in predestination looked upon the blessed call, justification, and glorification, my friend, what did He behold there but His own work of grace

whereby the elect are saved? Not because of the merit of works, but because of grace He calls, Rom. 9. By His grace, without merit, we are justified, Rom. 3; by grace we are saved, Eph. 2; faith also wherewith salvation is embraced is a work of God's grace, John 6; and suffering for Christ's sake is also a gift of God, Phil. 1."

"Although everything in this work of grace is wholly a work of grace, and we with our natural willing and running earn nothing toward our salvation, Rom. 9, nevertheless God requires of us the outward obedience which still lies in our power and ability, viz: attendance at church, diligent hearing of the Word, Rom. 10, searching of the Scriptures, John 5, 39, reading and meditating, Acts 8 and 17, etc. And this God requires according to His universal counsel and will of grace; not as a merit on our part, as though we by our own powers should or could prepare ourselves for the kingdom of heaven and earn the everlasting treasure; but as an ordained means, through which He intends to operate, give the Holy Spirit, produce, strengthen, and preserve repentance and true faith, and enkindle new motions in us, Rom. 10, Acts 10 and 16."

"From this it follows irrevocably and incontrovertibly that, if all the world would obey God and would yield to His eternal gracious counsel, gracious purpose, gracious order, and gracious determination as regards Christ, if none were to run counter to the revealed Word, if all were to submit themselves humbly to it by diligent hearing, reading, and meditation, and were to follow the universal counsel of grace till death, then Jesus Christ, who is presented as a Savior to all the world and ordained for all nations, would draw them all to Himself by the power and grace of His Holy Spirit, would most gladly give faith to all, and bestow eternal life upon all; so that on account of their foreknown saving vocation, Christian justification, and blessed glorification not only the eternal gracious will, gracious counsel, gracious instruction, gracious purpose, gracious determination, and gracious order as regards Christ, but also predestination, that is the gracious election or choice unto eternal life, would have extended to them all from eternity." (Nicolai's Works, Vol. 3, p. 315, etc.)

"Especial note must here be taken of the distinction between the antecedent gracious love which extends over all the world,

and the subsequent gracious election which embraces only the believing children of God."

"The gracious love of God, which belongs to His antecedent will, is meant seriously on the part of God, inasmuch as He presents His dear Son to all the world as its salvation and throne of grace, and directs all the children of Adam, without a single exception, to Him alone, that they all may accept His Word, all may be converted through the Holy Spirit, and all be filled with true, saving faith, and governed and guided accordingly, so that they all may turn from their sins, all trust the Gospel, all put their hope in Christ, all seek their salvation with fear and trembling, all walk in love, patience, and new obedience, and all adhere to Christ constantly till death."

"O praise the Lord (David sings), all ye nations, praise Him, all ye people, both young men and maidens, old men and children; let them praise the name of the Lord, Ps. 117 and 148. It is God's desire and earnest will that all, all men shall praise Him. And if this praise is to flow from faith and the prompting of the Holy Spirit, then assuredly He must offer the grace of faith and of the Holy Spirit, together with complete salvation, to all the children of men, and it must be his heartfelt intention to grant these blessings through the ordained means to all, yea to all, so that in all the wide world not a single man is excluded from this gracious love, from this gracious counsel, gracious will, and gracious offer of salvation."

"Predestination, however, regards only those who follow the universal counsel of grace and permit themselves to be drawn unto salvation by the universal ordained means and governed by them till death. This is not done by the whole world, although God would most heartily desire to see it, but only by some, and as compared with the whole human race only by a few; for the greater part despises the universal counsel of God and resists His fatherly will till death. There is no doubt, therefore, that God knows His own, and has known from eternity the little flock of those who keep to the Gospel, Baptism, and the Sacrament of the Altar, and permit themselves to be fully regenerated unto eternal life by the Holy Spirit; and that He has decreed and determined to save them through the ordained means, which particular decree the Scriptures designate by the term Prædestinatio or Electio, that is foreordination or election unto eternal life." (Ibid. p. 319.)

JOHN HABERMANN (AVENARIUS).

John Habermann* preaches in his Postill (of the year 1578) on the words, "Many are called, but few are chosen," as follows: "This passage closes Christ's parable, and this is His simple meaning. Many people are called of God to labor in His vineyard, but few are chosen to receive a good rich reward. For that many people are called and accepted as laborers is wholly God's grace and mercy, who would have all men to be saved and none excluded from His kingdom. Therefore He bids us, Matt. 11: Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest. But that only a few come and are chosen to receive a great reward is man's own fault, since the greater part are hypocrites and false Christians, who do not labor diligently, are not earnestly concerned about preaching, have neither faith nor love in their hearts, for they do not approve themselves servants of God in great patience, in tribulation, in necessities, in fears, etc. Hence this passage does not mean to say that God desires to choose only a few people from among the many that are called, and wishes to reject and make non-elect some that come and labor diligently in His vineyard.† On the contrary, God calls all, and those whom He calls He also justifies, that is chooses, in so far as they permit themselves to be called by the grace of God and chosen unto righteousness. But those who will not He lets go, because they prefer to walk in darkness rather than in the light. If now a man desires to know whether he is chosen, he need not climb into heaven, nor enter the heavenly council-chamber and trouble his mind about the secret providence of God; all he needs to do is to judge and decide according to the revealed Word and will of God. To state it briefly: See and know whether you are sorry for your sins, and whether in your sorrow you have a heartfelt trust and confidence in Christ, and finally whether you bring forth good fruits from faith. He who does this, or begins to

* Born 1516; he was pastor at different places, professor of theology at Jena and Wittenberg, and finally Superintendent in Saxony, when he signed the F. C. He died in 1590. He is known best by his pithy little prayer-book which is still used extensively.

† As Missouri teaches in reality, when it declares that God, in His free predestination, which according to His secret purpose pertains only to a few, "does not even inquire whether we have obeyed or not, but simply does as He wills."

do it, is most assuredly chosen and a child of eternal life.* Next week we will hear more of this."

The following sermon for the Sunday Sexagesima on the parable concerning the different kinds of soil begins with the words: "To-day a week ago we heard in the conclusion of the gospel-lesson the general declaration: Many are called, but few are chosen. The cause why many are called, and again the fault why but few are chosen our present parable sets forth clearly and distinctly;† it follows so closely upon the other for the very reason that one gospel may be the interpretation and explanation of the other. For it shows that a man went out to sow the good seed in his field everywhere, and yet the field does not yield fruit everywhere; this is not the fault of the man who went out to sow, or of the good seed, but of the field. So we must know: It is not the fault of God who chooses that few are chosen, nor of the Word through which they are chosen, but of man's own will and wickedness, who through Satan's hindering will not be chosen, preferring to follow the devil and his deception unto evil. God indeed could use force, but He will drag no man by the hairs into heaven; on the contrary, He draws those who permit themselves to be drawn by His Word and Spirit, and do not resist Him."‡

---

* Habermann, as he declares in the beginning, speaks here of the justified and the elect as being the same, as also Luther already, and many others after him, distinguish between those who "are" the elect, and those who "remain" the elect.

† Well, well, my dear old Habermann! So you are also attempting to "solve" and "make plausible to reason" this "mystery regarding certain persons" and their election unto salvation, by referring to the different hearers of the Word of God and the different conduct of men toward the gracious call of God? ! Missouri will soon enough "sweep out" your "gross synergism" and rationalism.

‡ Poor Habermann! In your best years you passed through the entire controversy concerning synergism and Flacianism, you even held a professorship at Jena and at Wittenberg, and but a year ago (1577), holding the office of Superintendent, you signed the F. C. (the second as well as the eleventh article), and now in spite of all this — as Missouri will soon impress upon you — you come with such grossly synergistic twaddle. Away with this F. C. synergist from the bosom of the Lutheran Church! He openly makes man's conversion and salvation dependent upon his own work and merit, upon his "permitting himself to be drawn"! But, all joking aside, who is really blind? All these men of the F. C.? Or St. Louis in its haughtiness and obduracy?

MATTHIAS HAFENREFFER.

Matthias Hafenreffer* writes in his renowned Compend: "What is predestination? It is the eternal will, counsel, and pleasure of God to save man through Christ embraced by faith,—How is this will of God divided? Into the antecedent and subsequent will; or, which is the same, into the universal and the particular will. For although God's will in its essence is a single and simple will, it is revealed in the Word so as to show not only what it intends in general regarding all men, but also what it has determined in particular regarding those who either obey the universal counsel, or resist it."

After treating of the antecedent will and its universality, Hafenreffer continues: "What is the subsequent or particular will of God? It is the eternal counsel or decree of God to save those who believe, and to damn those who do not believe.—How does this subsequent or particular will differ from the antecedent will of God? 1) The antecedent will has no contrary decree of reprobation; but the subsequent will is divided by different de-

* Born 1561; Magister in 1581; counsellor of the consistory and court-preacher at Tuebingen in 1590; Doctor of Theology and extraordinary professor in 1592; died in 1619. With Heerbrand, Osiander, Gerlach, and others he took part in the controversy of the Wuertembergers with Huber, as his signature in several of the documents shows. A number of the writings of the Wuertembergers against the Calvinists were composed by him in the name of the rest. His chief work is the Loci Theologici, published for the first time in 1600, then passing through many editions (Tuebingen 1603, 1606; Luebeck 1608, Wittenberg 1609, etc. In Sweden especially, as also in Denmark, the book was "introduced and regarded as a symbolical book" in the schools, or, as Val. Andreæ expresses it: Cynosura Orthodoxiae, the Guiding Star of Orthodoxy). Huelsemann writes in his "Calixtine Worm of Conscience", p. 119: "In the excellent kingdom of Sweden the Loci communes D. Matthiae Hafenrefferi, professor of theology at Tuebingen, were introduced already in 1612 by a public order of the king, to be used for the lectures in the University at Upsala and in other Colleges, to be read, and the coming clergy to become accustomed to; they were there reprinted, a Compend or Extract was made and published for particular schools by the Archbishop Peter Kenicus" (who was active in introducing the F. C. in Sweden, in 1593) . . . . "and public lectures on Hafenreffer's Loci continue in the excellent University Upsala to the present day." John Sebastian Lysander, a zealous destroyer of Lutheran writings, came to a knowledge of the truth through a Slavonian translation of Hafenreffer's Loci. The Wuertemberg princess Anna Johanna translated the book into German. It is said to have been translated also into Danish.

crees, one concerning those to be saved, and one concerning those to be damned. 2) The antecedent will embraces in general all men and offers salvation to all, that they may believe and be saved; the subsequent will, however, takes cognizance of man's obedience or disobedience, inasmuch as they believe the universal counsel of God, or resisting it disbelieve. 3) The antecedent will has reference to this one thing only, that men may be rescued from their misery through faith in Christ; the subsequent will ordains those who believe unto salvation, those who do not believe unto damnation.—Prove this subsequent will for me and the difference of the decrees from the Scriptures! Mark 16, 16; John 1, 12; John 3, 18; 1 Cor. 1, 21.*—What then is the predestination of God's children? It is the will, counsel, or pleasure, and purpose of God whereby He resolved from eternity, in mere grace and mercy, through and for the sake of Christ to save those who believe.† — But whence arises this particularity of the subsequent will? The cause of this particularity does not originate in God, who earnestly, constantly, and with burning heart desires that all men may believe and be saved through faith in Christ; the fault lies in men themselves, who do not obey and do not believe the beneficent and universal pleasure of God. For lack of faith alone is the cause of particularity and of condemnation.— If lack of faith is the cause of particularity, it still seems as though this is due not to men, but to God, since faith is not in man's power, but a gift of God!‡ Faith cometh by the hearing of the

* These passages simply declare that he who believes shall be saved, yet according to Hafenreffer they all treat of the decree which assures salvation to all foreseen individual believers. But according to Missouri there is no such decree; for the election of persons without faith has already decided the matter.

† In our copy the word "those who believe" is very strongly emphacised — "CREDENTES." It is plain that Hafenreffer meant especially to emphasize over against the election of some or of all sinners without faith, as then taught by Calvinists and Huberians (and now by Missouri), the election of "God's children", the election "in mere grace, for the sake of Christ", as confessed in the F. C., and pertaining only to believers in Christ as such, and therefore taking place in view of their faith.

‡ What would the answer to this question have to be, if Hafenreffer were a Missourian? Would he not have referred to the "free (free in the Missourian sense, i. e. asking nothing, unconditional) grace" of God and the "mystery hovering only over a few"; and would he not have said: "No man has a right to question God on this point! He indeed could just as easily convert all as He converts the elect, but He here upholds His right

Word, Rom. 10, 17. For this reason faith is not in man's power, since all do not hear the Word, and since those who do hear, for many reasons by their own fault prevent the divine seed from bringing its fruit in them; as Christ teaches in the parable" (concerning the different soil), Matt. 13. 4. For it is certain that the Holy Spirit wills to operate in all who hear the Word and to grant them faith and conversion; but many resist the Holy Spirit, and either despise the means, or hinder them, or fall away again.— Is it not Calvinistic to teach a particularity in the doctrine of election?* The particularity of Calvinism is as different from ours as is heaven and earth. For the Calvinists ascribe the first cause of particularity to God Himself, who, as they say, rejected without regard to unbelief, by His unconditional pleasure, the majority of men, yea and created them for damnation. But we ascribe all the cause of this particularity to man's guilt and unbelief.† — What now is a brief summary of all you have stated respecting the antecedent and the subsequent will? It is this: The allmerciful God has indeed had compassion on the whole human race, and has formed the most gracious determination to save all without exception through faith in Christ. But since many by their own fault and disobedience are such as do not believe (non crediturі erant), God has resolved in the same way from eternity, on the one hand, to give salvation to those who believe, on the other hand, to condemn those who do not believe.—But does not the particularity of the subsequent will abolish the universality of the antecedent will? By no means! For these are not

---

to do as He wills, without asking whether we have obeyed or not." — What poor Missourians all these men of the F. C. were!

* This was Huber's objection to the doctrine of the election of believers as such, which he rejected, refusing to admit any particular decree of election. But together with the theologians of the F. C. we hold fast to this election of believers, which Huber at first, and now Missouri (although for different reasons), has branded so shamefully as being heretical. Still Dr. Walther finds it possible, we are sorry to say it, to commit this piece of godlessness: he puts us and Huber together, and then himself, his adherents, and the Wuertembergers etc., as brethren in the faith!

† It is impossible for Missouri to confess this heartily, as long as it holds fast the fundamental proposition in regard to election and reprobation, that God "could remove the resistance" of all men "just as easily as He removes that of the elect", but that "on the other hand" (i. e. in contradistinction to the universal will of grace) "He here upholds His right (1) to have mercy on whom He will have mercy, and (2) to harden whom He will harden." This is pure Calvinism!

contradictory, they are subordinate wills. God wills that all men may believe and be saved through faith. But since many through their own fault do not believe, they are for this reason condemned by the subsequent will; those, however, who believe are saved."*

In speaking of the contrary doctrine, Hafenreffer mentions Huber as "expelling faith from the act of eternal election, and dreaming that the act of election is complete in these two things, God's merciful will and Christ's merit. And by thus asserting that election is absolute in Christ, he (Huber) so places the universal will of God in opposition to the particular decree as to make it appear that the two involve a contradiction."†

In the preface to the Loci Hafenreffer writes, justifying the order in which he introduces the different articles: "The first Locus in this (third) part is that of predestination, or the counsel for restoring man's salvation, which mystery was hidden from eternity, but is now revealed in the Word. Since this counsel of predestination is not absolute, but qualified and limited in Christ, as He is to be embraced by faith, therefore we must in the second place treat at once of Christ, as the Captain of our salvation. . . . Furthermore, since the counsel of restoring man is not absolute in Christ,‡ but limited by Christ as He is to be embraced by faith, therefore, we must in the third place treat of faith by which we embrace Christ, our Restorer, and appropriate His benefits prepared for us, according to the eternal counsel of predestination. Again, since faith is not man's, but God's work and gift, and since Christ, our Restorer, administered His triple (prophetic, royal, and highpriestly) office most faithfully for the purpose that faith might be imparted to us and preserved and strengthened till the end (for the great prophet awakens repentance and faith in our hearts through the work of the Word, of the Law and the Gospel), therefore we must treat in the fourth place of the Law and the Gospel. . . . But since (as Christ, the most faith-

* Missouri, however, is determined to hold fast at this point the "mystery" of two "contradictory wills": 1) God does not regard faith in electing unto salvation, choosing without faith for the sake of the unappropriated merit of Christ; 2) God regards faith to such an extent in election that He did not choose so many only because they lacked faith! !

† As far as the idea of election is concerned, in the question concerning the relation between faith and election, Missouri's doctrine resembles that of Huber as one egg resembles another. This St. Louis will not be able to deny.

‡ As Huberians and Missourians teach.

ful Prophet, indeed earnestly desires) all men do not obey the Gospel, nor lend their ears or constant obedience to the Word of faith, therefore Christ the King gathers an especial kingdom, that is the church, of which the following article treats."

LUKE OSIANDER.

Luke Osiander* wrote a book in 1593, which his Wuetermberg colleagues recommended, against Franz Puccius, a liberalistic Italian, who claimed that all men would be saved by virtue of Christ's redemption through a kind of natural faith, hence, without faith in the Gospel. Osiander indeed does not in his investigations treat explicitly of "predestination"—as we should most certainly expect a true Missourian to do—but he dwells repeatedly on the difference between God's universal will of grace and the particular decree of salvation, so that we can see clearly whether he teaches with Missouri, that the elective decree of salvation was formed without regard to faith, or with us Lutherans the opposite doctrine, that believers as such are the adequate (real) objects of the elective, separating decree of salvation. Osiander writes:

"Since God had already, in a manner stated above,† demonstrated His friendship for man more than sufficiently, it surely will not detract from His equity or from this friendship of His,

* See the note above. — Since St. Louis appeals so strongly to Osiander, we call upon him for this particular testimony, although the fact, that he confessed agreement in doctrine with the Wittenbergers and Wuertembergers would be testimony enough. How different in every respect these refutations of Huber would have been, if they had been intended to defend the Missourian doctrine.

† Osiander shows at considerable length in the preceding discussion that God earnestly called all men from Adam on. He declares for instance: "God promised Christ to our first parents and their descendants, so that whosoever believes in Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life. God has opened heaven for all men, if only they had desired to enter. He called Cain to repentance, if only he would have obeyed. All could have learned the right way unto salvation, if they had desired it. God has at all times shown the way of salvation to men, if only they had been ready to follow it. If men would take as much trouble in searching out the truth (as they take in securing riches, honor, pleasure), they would without a doubt reach the happy haven of eternal salvation. But voluntarily (sponte) they close their eyes", etc.

when He does not save those who do not believe in Christ, since He has long ago revealed His decree to the world, that He would save none outside of Christ.* For there is salvation in none other, and no other name given among men whereby we must be saved. To him who does not believe in this only Savior we can promise no efficacy of the Savior Christ" (this surely means to say: Without faith Christ is of no benefit). "For God's decree, irrevocably revealed in the Holy Scriptures, promises salvation to none save believers in Christ." (Page 19.)

"It is one thing, that God in His Word has revealed His will most clearly; it is another thing, that some men do not accept this revealed gracious will. For the revelation of the divine will (in the Gospel) is intended for the many; but the appropriation of the divine mercy is only for those who receive the gift of faith. And faith (St. Paul tells us) is not for every man, 2 Thess. 3, 2. For this reason Christ teaches repeatedly: Many are called, but few are chosen. And Christ calls His church the little flock." (Page 128.†)

"When Puccius imputes envy to God, because He excludes those from the power and beneficent efficacy of Christ's merit who do not believe in Christ, who do not receive the gift of special grace‡ and lack Baptism, he blasphemously accuses God of injustice because God formed the determination that He would save those only who believe in Christ. For God publicly promulgated this determination in the Holy Scriptures. Paul says of God the Father: He chose us in Christ before the founda-

* Osiander here takes up the thought of the F. C., which declares: "In Christ we are to seek the eternal election of the Father, who in His eternal divine counsel determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him." There is only one divine decree of salvation. If God in His universal will of grace looked for faith, and if election is this decree of salvation, then election has looked for faith. Who can deny this?

† Osiander states clearly that in the words: "Few are chosen", Christ means that of believers and hence of those who are saved there are but few. On Eph. 1, 4 this same Osiander writes: "God chose us unto eternal life before the creation of the world, and formed the decree concerning us, that He would save us through Christ (if we would believe in Him)." A decree of salvation without the condition of faith in Christ is evidently a second, different will of grace.

‡ By "special grace" Osiander means, as is shown clearly on page 12, the grace of the Holy Spirit in the means of grace, as distinguished from the "natural grace" of Puccius. Cf. pp. 107-109.

tion of the world. Therefore he who is not implanted in Christ through faith and Baptism, that he may become a spiritual member of Christ, has no part in the kingdom of God; and he who is not a branch of the vine Christ cannot partake of His benefits. Branches, however, are planted in the vine Christ only by faith." (Page 12.)

"The instrumental cause of our salvation is faith in Christ; to him who lacks this Christ is of no benefit." (Well, well, Osiander! If you were a true Missourian you would "self-evidently abhor" such language!) "Christ declares: He that believeth in the Son will not be judged (i. e. condemned); but he who believeth not is already judged (i. e. eternal damnation, if he persists in unbelief, is already surely fixed for him), because he does not believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God. In these words, Puccius, you have the instrumental cause, by which the salvation obtained in Christ is received. . . . Christ, the Savior benefits no one save those who are awakened from the death of sin through true and explicit faith in the only begotten Son of God." (Page 46.)

"That God wants all men to be saved, if they themselves also want to be saved, is not the question. But that He will save those who do not use the means ordained unto salvation, the Scriptures nowhere declare, they state the very opposite. And the passage mentioned (1 Tim. 2, 4), which Puccius quotes, refutes his error. Paul commands that we pray for all men, also for the heathen government. He gives as his reason, that God wants all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth. In these words Paul shows how men can be saved." (Page 139.)

Osiander, in perfect agreement with the other Wuertemberg theologians, as also with the Wittenbergers, held fast over against Huber to the truth, that the real election of persons unto the certain attainment of salvation, or the particular divine decree of salvation, has foreseen faith as its presupposition; he taught the same scriptural and confessional truth in unison with the same theologians over against the Calvinists, and declared explicitly that this also is the sense of the 11th article of the F. C. In 1601, for instance, the Wuertemberg theologians—among them L. Osiander as one of the most respected fathers (he died in 1604)—issued their "Sound and Thorough Report" against the Staffort

Book of the Count of Baden. They lay stress on the fact, that in the doctrine of predestination faith is "not to be regarded as an efficient, meritorious, complete cause, or one for the sake of which we are chosen; no, by no means, but as a secondary cause, by which we grasp the merit of Christ (in whom and for the sake of whom we were chosen) and apply and appropriate it to ourselves." 'Faith, however," they tell us, "or its ordination belongs not only to the execution, but also to the counsel of our salvation and to election itself." "As also the Christian Book of Concord places faith in Christ among the eight antecedent parts" (the well-known eight points), "which must be taken together when we speak of God's eternal election unto sonship, just as the Epitome declares explicitly that God in His eternal counsel determined to save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him. Therefore saving faith is embodied in eternal predestination, not as a cause and merit of predestination, but as a necessary, constituent, without which the doctrine of election would be incomplete, since we are chosen in Christ, and Christ cannot be embraced and His merit applied to us except by faith." (Page 709.) God, therefore, we are told, "did not choose absolutely, but in gracious view of faith in Christ." ("K. Z." as quoted above.)

JOHN COLER.

John Coler, son of Jacob Coler (Koehler), referred to above, published from the posthumous papers of his father, in 1614, a work entitled: "Oeconomia Ecclesiastica: A Spiritual and Useful Book for the House concerning the Lutheran, the Papal, the Calvinistic, and the Turkish Faith." In this work of 1262 pages he places the doctrinal propositions of the four "chief religions" mentioned side by side in parallel columns, so that "every layman may not only see the certainty of his faith," but may also avoid the "chief errors of these three spirits of error, and may approve himself a good warrior." "I know well," he tells us in the preface, "that I bring nothing new." The Lutheran doctrine which he set forth, also the doctrine of predestination, was therefore not new, but the general doctrine, preached, taught, defended, and held fast as Lutheran in churches, schools, universities, and congregations since the memory of man, and especially since the

adoption of the Formula of Concord. And now how does Coler set forth the doctrine of our Lutheran Church in this comparative exhibition of the doctrines of the different religions? What does he declare to be, not his own private opinion or the opinion of a few theologians, but the unanimous, universally acknowledged, undisputed Lutheran doctrine concerning predestination?

On page 212 we read the heading: "Lutheran Faith: How God in His paternal heart elects believers unto eternal life." By the side of this we find as the faith of Calvinists: "God elects the smallest number unto eternal life, and this without regard to any means." The "Lutheran Faith" is elaborated as follows:

"When we contemplate God, our heavenly Father, according to His fatherly heart, as the eagle, St. John, in spiritual loftiness pictures Him, declaring that He is love itself (1 John 4), we find that He was not idle before the creation of this resplendent heaven and of this beautiful widely extended earth and all that stirs and moves therein, but that on His part He, as essential love, has begotten and born the Son from eternity, who also as eternal love remains in the Father's bosom, from whom and the Father the Holy Spirit proceeds as essential eternal love, yea, as the flame and indissoluable bond of love between the Father and the Son."

"But as far as we are concerned, He has taken counsel and determined from eternity in pure fatherly love, grace, and mercy, how He would create man and have him blessed. As Paul also, among other things, clearly testifies, saying: Elegit nos in Christo, He has chosen us, before the foundation of the world, through Christ." (In the margin we find the note: "N. B. Election unto life in Christ. Note this well.")

"For as an omniscient God, for whom nothing is future or past, but everything constantly present, He foresaw and knew that, if He were to create man in His image unto eternal life in pure love and unto voluntary reciprocal love, man would fall through the cunning and deception of the devil and the abuse of His free will, would transgress His commandment, and plunge himself and all his descendants into temporal and eternal distress. Therefore He furthermore counseled, decreed, and determined to send into the flesh His most beloved only begotten Son for the whole fallen human race as an Asylum, Savior, and Bringer of salvation, so that none of them might perish and be condemned." (In the margin: "Christ is given to all, and the Gospel proclaimed to all men, that thereby they might be directed to Christ.")

"And therefore He sent the Word, which alone is able to save, out into all the wide world and proclaimed it to all nations and tongues and directed all, all of them to this brazen serpent, Jesus Christ."

"This gracious love some, following the old teacher Damascenus, call the antecedent fatherly will of God, and this not improperly. Others, however, as Dr. Samuel Huber and his allies, entitle this universal decree of grace an election which extends over all men (sed minus proprie, i. e. improperly speaking), whether they believe or do not believe. Inasmuch as it has taken into account (1) the reconciliation of the whole human race, (2) the purchase of eternal salvation, and (3) the Word calling all nations to this gracious salvation in Christ. But just as God, our heavenly Father, was not ignorant of the pitiable fall of our first parents, and as He ordained and devised counsel and help on account of it, so also He saw fully and really and was not in ignorance regarding the fact, that by far the greater part of mankind would resist His Spirit, would despise His saving counsel regarding themselves, would cast away His Word, and consider themselves unworthy of eternal life."

"And for this reason He decreed and determined, according to His subsequent will, concerning all the children of men what their final end should be. Thus: those who believe and persevere to the end shall be saved." (In the margin: "Which are properly the elect.") "But those who do not believe shall remain beneath the wrath of God."*

* The sum and substance of the present controversy between Lutherans and Missourian Calvinists may be clearly summarized in the question: Are God's gracious will to save all men through Christ, and His elective decree to save only certain persons, two different wills of grace in God, or are they subordinate and harmonized by the foresight of faith? We Lutherans maintain the latter, and hence we distinguish, as did our fathers, between the antecedent and the subsequent will of God. The former is the universal will of God's grace and love, according to which He would have all men without exception to be saved through faith in Christ. The latter is the fixed will of God's decree, which foresees actual faith and unbelief and then declares, on the one hand: "Thou art chosen and predestinated unto salvation," and on the other: "Thou canst not be chosen unto salvation, because thou dost not believe in the Savior." Missouri, however, rejects this distinction, and teaches in contradicting it, that the universal will of grace and the particular election of grace both refer to the whole unbelieving mass of sinners, as they lie without distinction in their general depravity; and, following this view, God is said to choose a certain ex-

"From this decree now there originates and flows out election unto eternal life and reprobation unto eternal damnation. This reprobation, however, is by no means due to God, but to the devil and the wickedness of the human heart. For the foundation of God standeth sure: The Lord knoweth them that are His and will let no one tear them from His hands where He has written their names; since they permit themselves (!*) to be drawn by His Spirit, and permit (!) their hearts to be opened,

clusive number from this mass which is altogether alike, choosing them unto eternal life as the final goal, and by the same decree of salvation also unto infallible conversion and perseverance as the way for attaining this goal. A person must indeed be altogether blind, if he does not see, or rather will not see, that what is here called "predestination" is simply another will of grace, a will of grace altogether different from the universal will of grace, yea contradicting this will directly. An honest Missourian must acknowledge this: "We Missourians teach that God, before He chose men to salvation, did indeed look for faith in a certain number and made their election strictly dependent on whether they would believe in Christ, refusing to elect them because of their unbelief; in the case of others God did not look for faith, or if He looked, saw them also in the same depravity, but elected them in spite of it. Our Missourian 'mystery' therefore consists really in this inequality in the will of God's grace, this inequality which decides everything." This is how an honest Missourian would have to set forth his doctrine concerning the relation between the so-called election of grace and the universal will of grace. The two are so completely "altogether different things", that God by virtue of His universal will of grace always wills to ordain only those who believe, and these as believers, unto salvation, and not a single sinner without believing, or without the foresight of faith in Christ; while this same truthful God, on the other hand, by virtue of election and in His "secret counsel" does in reality elect and ordain unto eternal life the "few" as sinners without faith. Consequently, God's will, we are told, is in the one case the very opposite of what it is in the other. What is yea here, is nay there; what is yea there, is nay here. All that God declares so earnestly and solemnly unto all men, that so and in no other way He would decree their salvation, namely according to His knowledge of their conversion and perseverence through the power of His universal grace, all this is simply to be set aside in "predestination." Here, they tell us, God does not at all seek and inquire after conversion and perseverence, but proceeds without anything further to ordain this and that sinner as such unto eternal life! Now if God's decree of salvation looks for faith in all in the same way, or if it looks for faith in none at all, then His will is equal for all. But to teach that God looks for faith in the case of some, and does not look for faith in the case of others, is to impute to God an unequal will regarding salvation!

* Well, well, what a poor Missourian you are! "Permit themselves", etc.! !

hear the Word in meekness and accept it, keep it in their hearts, and govern their lives according to this Word which is able to save their souls, believe in Christ, use the Holy Sacraments, and remain steadfast to the end through the power of the Holy Spirit."

"The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men. . . . God will have all men to be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth. God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest. From these and similar passages it appears sufficiently that God, our heavenly Father, did not nakedly, without any condition choose some few men unto eternal life, and that He is the only cause why there are so few and such a small number of the elect; on the contrary, it appears that He would most heartily have all men obtain salvation, for which reason also He reconciled the whole world unto Himself in Christ, and it is His will, that they may believe and repent and persevere to the end."

"However, since Christ came unto His own, and His own received Him not, He has given power to become the children of God to those alone who believe in His name" (in the margin: "Who are properly the elect"). And accordingly our heavenly Father predestinated, ordained, and elected unto eternal life all those of whom He foresaw and knew that they would believe in His Son Christ Jesus" (in the margin: "Rom. 8; Eph. 1; Heb. 11; Rom. 11; John 10; Col. 1; 2 Thess. 2")—"(not indeed propter ipsorum credere, sed propter Christum, in quem credunt, not for the sake of their faith as a meritorious cause, as in times past the Pelagians dreamed, and as Augustine before he retracted, together with Ambrosius and Chrysostom, who also erred on this point, taught; but for the sake of Christ in whom they believe)—and persevere in Him to the end and permit themselves (!*) to be governed and guided by the Holy Spirit. For faith alone is the spiritual hand which embraces Christ, in whom we are chosen, and all the blessings He obtained for us."†

---

* Here again this "permit themselves" so distasteful to Missouri.

† This was the doctrine of our Lutheran fathers, the faithful theologians of the Church of the Formula of Concord; and this is our doctrine. Whether a sinner is really to have the righteousness and salvation obtained by Christ, or not (whether he is to be chosen unto justification and salvation, or not), depends in the will of God on whether he believes in his Savior, or not. So teaches the entire Gospel of Christ; so believes and

MATTHEW VOGEL.

We have already brought a testimony from Vogel, which we found quoted in the Acta Huberiana. It was probably taken from his Latin Thesaurus, which, however, is only an extract from the larger German work of Vogel* issued at Tuebingen in 1587 in 7 folio volumes with the title: "Treasury of the Holy Divine Scriptures." The first part treats of the "Chief Articles of our Christian Religion," and among these also (pp. 479-499) "concerning the eternal predestination and election of God." The work was issued "With a Preface by the Theological Faculty of Tuebingen and by the Consistorium of the Principality of Stuttgart." Here we read among other things: "We do not doubt, since these writings have been drawn purely and only from the Word of God, that the Almighty will effect much good through them in His beloved church. For the Word of God, when proclaimed in truth and purity, cannot but bring fruit and benefit. This work will be of service to a pastor and preacher, whatever

---

confesses our evangelical Church. Missouri indeed comes trotting along with its wisdom borrowed from Calvin and declares: "How is this possible! In God there are no conditions! He Himself must first work and give faith, He Himself must decree who is to have faith or in whom He will work faith; how can God then seek, search, or inquire for this faith which He Himself must give and work! !" — Is not this a beautiful piece of wisdom in the fine appearance of an angel of light, overthrowing so completely at one sweep the entire Lutheran doctrine of justification through faith? ! For evidently we would have to continue in the same strain: "How could God leave it to be decided by faith, whom He will justify in time and bring to salvation, and whom not? Election unto justification and salvation has already taken place from eternity without regard to faith. And surely, God could not decree then who is surely to be saved and therefore now in time to come to faith and to die therein, and afterwards in a most superfluous way decree once more that those who now so live and die in faith shall actually be justified and saved. No; God decrees nothing superfluous. Not for this reason, therefore, does God now in time justify and save certain sinners in preference to others, because He looks to faith or inquires regarding the appropriation of Christ's merit, and makes the merit of Christ as appropriated by faith the decisive thing. On the contrary, the very opposite takes place; the fact that these and not those are the ones to be justified and saved has been decided already from eternity by the mere pleasure of the free and hidden purpose of God, and for this reason God brings these who have been freely chosen unto justification unto faith as the "means for carrying His election into effect." — Consequently, faith decides nothing at all any more!

* It has but recently come into our possession.

the article or Locus communis (point of doctrine) may be which he intends to treat in a sermon, furnishing him at once testimony and examples from the Holy Scriptures for the Christian elucidation and proof of the matter in hand. Here he will find everything together, in its proper order, regularly arranged, so that in a very short space of time he will be able to work out a well-ordered, rich, and well-founded sermon." Adami also states that Vogel tried to serve "candidates of theology and servants of the church, especially the younger among them" by his Concordance in 7 volumes.

Now picture to yourself the circumstances as far as the question is concerned, whether the doctrine of predestination as presented in this work was really the doctrine of the Lutheran Church at that time or not. Vogel himself had already signed the F. C. as Superintendent (Abbot) of Alperspach. In 1581 he was already preparing for the publication of his Treasury; it was recommended by the Tuebingen Faculty and the Stuttgart Consistory (among these also Luke Osiander, sen.), and finally reached its completion in 1587. The work was meant to serve especially "candidates, pastors, and preachers" in working out their sermons, and, to be published complete, it required a wide circulation. It is to contain nothing but the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures and of the Lutheran Confessions, hence the article 'Concerning the predestination and election of God" in strict accord with the 11th article of the F. C., which had just been adopted by the Lutheran Church as the correct expression of its faith in its conscious opposition to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. Is it possible, is it conceivable that Vogel should have set forth in this work as the doctrine of the Scriptures and of the Lutheran Church a doctrine altogether different from that which the contemporary Lutheran Church understood to be the doctrine of the Scriptures and the Confession? Would not hundreds, yea thousands of teachers and laymen have objected at once and asked: "What? Is this to be the Lutheran doctrine of predestination and election? This has never been our Lutheran doctrine of election, and shall not now be sent out by Vogel as Lutheran doctrine without earnest contradiction on our part! No! We Lutherans do not teach as Vogel declares; on the contrary we teach so and so," etc. But not a single voice in all the Lutheran Church is heard objecting! If the Lutheran Church at

that time had been Missourian in the doctrine of predestination, there would have been a shouting and a tumult and a rattling of swords in the entire church of Germany so great as to be completely overwhelming. In the shortest space of time Vogel would have been placed on the Missourian theological pyre and dutifully reduced to ashes as a heretic and deceiver, and his "Treasury" would have been put on the Index of prohibited books. But nothing of the kind occurred!

And another thing dare not be forgotten in this connection. Adami tells us that Matthew Vogel "was a pupil of Luther for five years, and the doctrine he learned of him he promulgated as long as he lived." This is Vogel's testimonial as a faithful pupil of Luther. And his flight to Prussia on account of the Interim confirms the fact, that he was a stalwart, faithful scholar of Luther, by whom personally, in 1544 or 1545, "after due public examination he had been found worthy of having the work of the church entrusted to his care." There cannot be the least doubt that Vogel in his Treasury, which had been completed at least 11 years, and had been in print 5 years before the outbreak of the Huber controversy, set forth the faith of the Lutheran Church as it then actually lived in the hearts of its members and was preached from its pulpits; and this also as regards "predestination and election," yea as regards this "chief article" especially, which since 1586 had been placed in the forefront of discussion by the renowned Mœmpelgart debate between Andreæ and Beza, and became from this time on the main point of difference between the two churches. Let us hear now our old Luther-Bird (Vogel=bird) sing his song on "predestination and election, and then you may ask: How does this agree with Missouri? If this was the doctrine of the F. C., how then does Missouri agree with this Church and with its doctrine and Confessions? This, doubtless, is another, great historical "mystery": all these theologians and leaders of the Lutheran Church had deviated from the Scriptures and the Symbol, but the Church itself believed as Missouri believes, merely lacking courage to open its mouth against its highly respected theologians. But let us hear our Luther-Bird: "Concerning the eternal predestination and election of God."

1. "GOD CHOSE MEN UNTO ETERNAL SALVATION THROUGH CHRIST BEFORE THE BEGINNING OF THE WORLD."

(a) Why do papists and baptists trust in their works before God? God in His unspeakable grace and mercy having chosen us men before we existed, yea before the foundation of the world, through Christ, His beloved Son?* (Passages: Tit. 1: Eternal life was promised before the world began,—before man or any other creature had been created. Eternal life, therefore, is no merit of man, but a gift of God bestowed upon man in pure mercy through Christ. 1 Peter 1: Christ was foreordained before the foundation of the world,—that through Him alone the human race should be blessed.)

(b) And accordingly He predestinated and ordained us unto eternal salvation without any merit or worthiness on our part." (Passages: Rom. 9: The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil;—since temporal blessings do not flow from man's merit, but from the grace of God, the same is much more true and certain of eternal blessing or life. Rom. 9: As God Himself declares: I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy;—I find no worthiness or merit in man on account of which I am gracious toward him; if I would not have mercy upon him, he would be condemned eternally in his sins according to his merit; but I have mercy on all who comfort themselves with the promised seed of the woman.)

(c) Thus the chief article of justification is confirmed and explained by the doctrine of the predestination and election of God (the article according to which we men, who are altogether sinners, are justified without merit, by the grace of God, through Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of His will, unto the praise of His glorious grace, through whom He hath made us accepted in the Beloved).

(d) In the same way the heavenly counsel and election of God unto eternal life is published and opened by the doctrine of the justification of man before God. (Passages: Baruch 3: God has revealed His will to us. Eph. 1: Having made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure, and having revealed it that it should be preached in the fulness

* We give Vogel's main propositions in full; from the passages and remarks we print only such as serve to show Vogel's doctrine with all clearness.

of time—the mystery, i. e. His heavenly counsel according to which He determined to save the human race through Christ. 1 Peter 1: For salvation is prepared, and Christ verily foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times. 1 John 1: The life that is eternal, which was with the Father, is declared—that is, Christ, the eternal Word, who was in the beginning with God and became flesh to redeem the human race, is declared and proclaimed alike among Jews and Gentiles. Rom. 1: And the righteousness which avails before God is revealed in the Gospel. John 3: In this manner, that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."*

2. "THE MEANS, THROUGH WHICH GOD REVEALED EVER MORE FULLY HIS HEAVENLY COUNSEL REGARDING MAN'S SALVATION, AND THROUGH WHICH ALSO HE CONSTANTLY ACCOMPLISHES OR CARRIES IT OUT IN THE ELECT.

(e) For as God wants all men to be saved (Prov. 2: God has created man unto eternal life. 2 Peter 3: It is not His will that any should be lost. 1 Tim. 2: But that all may be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth).

(f) So also God has ordained Christ, His Son, as the Savior for the whole human race, and soon after the fall of man promised Him through the patriarchs and prophets in words of increasing consolation. (Passages: Heb. 13: Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—i. e. through Christ not only we now, but also all others who believed before us and who shall come after us, are saved. 1 John 4: The Savior of the world. Hagg. 2: The Desire of all nations. John 1: The true light which lighteth every man—i. e. just as the sun offers its radiance to all men on earth, if they step out into it, or as the flowing spout of a well offers and bestows water upon all the in-

* Now ask yourself honestly whether good old Vogel did not teach as the first part of "the eternal predestination and election of God", that God determined to save all men through Christ and directed all to Christ as their Savior. This he expresses, as did many others before the Huber controversy, with the words then altogether unsuspicious: "God chose men unto eternal salvation through Christ before the beginning of the world." This too is evidently the first part of the idea of election in the F. C.

habitants of a city who come and get it, so also Christ the true knowledge of God to those who accept it by faith.)

(g) And at the appointed time, according to these promises of the prophets He sent the Son into the world, that by His suffering and death He might atone and pay for the sins of all men. (John 1: Hence Christ is the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world. John 12: And when I am lifted up I will draw all men unto me—i. e. and through me to God, my Father, that they may be joined as children to their Father.)

(h) And thereupon He caused Christ's suffering and death to be proclaimed in all the world through the preaching of the Gospel. (Passages: Mark 16: So also Christ commanded His apostles that they should go into all the world and preach the Gospel to all creatures—i. e. all men, of whatever nation, or race, or condition they may be.)

(i) God thereby revealed His secret counsel, and publicly called all men unto the salvation to which before the beginning of the world He had destined and chosen them, and such gracious calling still continues constantly through pure, faithful servants of the church. (Passages: Rom. 8: Whom He did predestinate, them He also called—i. e. chosen and predestinated unto eternal life. Matt. 22: As is pictured by the servants in the parable of Christ, those who are selected to call the guests to the marriage. 2 Thess. 5: God is faithful who calls us, 2 Tim. 1, 9: with a holy calling, Gal. 1: into the grace of Christ, 1 Thess. 2: and unto His kingdom and His glory. Rev. 19: Let us therefore be glad and rejoice and give honor to Him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife (the elect believing Church) hath made herself ready.)

(j) God, however, does not only call, but also directs, admonishes, and draws men, as much as lieth in Him, by the Word and the power of the Spirit, that they may accept Christ, His Son, as He is so comfortingly presented and offered in the Gospel, by true faith. (Passages: John 6: Christ Himself declares: No man can come to me (believe in me) except the Father draw him (work such faith in him); as is written in the prophets: And they shall all be taught of God (understand, however, taught by the public office of the ministry). John 5: As the Father hath now borne witness of the Son, 2 Cor. 5: so now He still admonishes by

His servants, who as embassadors beseech us: Be ye reconciled to God.*)

(k) And this with the declaration that all who rightly believe are truly the elect. (Passages: John 3: God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. John 11: Jesus should die, not for the nation of Israel alone, but that He should gather together in one the children of God (the elect among men) that were scattered abroad (also among the Gentiles). John 12: Hence Christ also declares: If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me. John 6: All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out—i. e. those whom the Father hath predestinated or chosen in me unto eternal life believe in me and will partake of life through faith. John 17: He therefore also tells the Father: I have manifested Thy name unto the men which Thou gavest me out of the world. Rom. 9: So then those are God's children, that are children not according to the flesh, but the children of the promise, are accounted Abraham's seed—i. e. God's elect Chuch. Rom. 4: Those who are of the faith of Abraham—i. e. all those who believe in Christ, as Abraham believed, are God's elect children. John 1, 12: As many as received Christ, to them He gave power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name. John 10: As Christ again declares: My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give them eternal life.)

(l) And the elect are all written in the book of life. (Passages: Is. 49: God declares concerning the elect: Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands. Is. 4: Every one that is called holy is written among the living in Jerusalem — i. e. all believers, to whom Christ's holiness is imputed, are written among the number of the elect. John 10: As also Christ declares: I know my sheep, and am known of mine. Luke 10: He admonishes them for this reason: Rejoice, because your names are written in heaven. Rev. 20: And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.)

(m) This book of life is Christ Himself, and, as it were,

---

* Our copy contains the manuscript note in the margin:

"He that believeth is elected;
He that believeth not, rejected."

is opened and read to us through the preaching of the Gospel, so that the elect of God may be clearly known from its pages. (Passages: Rev. 5: Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof — i. e. no man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father hath declared Him unto us, and hath commanded His apostles to preach in all the world.)

(n) Those who now, following this call, admonition, and declaration, hear the Gospel of Christ and submit* to the operation of the Holy Spirit, are brought to faith through His grace and power and are justified through faith. Passages: Sirach 18, 10: The Lord has compassion on all who let themselves be drawn (understand: drawn by His Spirit) and diligently hear God's Word. Sir. 15: Whosoever keepeth to God's Word findeth wisdom. Prov. 2: When wisdom (God's Holy Word) entereth into thine heart, and knowledge is pleasant unto thy soul, discretion shall preserve thee. Acts 8: The eunuch of Ethiopia came to believe, when he requested Philip to sit beside him in his chariot and explain the prophet Isaiah to him. Acts 13: Nevertheless, when the Gentiles at Antioch and in Pisidia heard Paul's preaching, they were glad and glorified the word of the Lord; and as many as were ordained unto eternal life believed. Rom. 8: Whom God predestinated, them He also called (through the preaching of the Gospel); and whom He called (of the number of the elect who believe the Gospel), them He also justified (for their faith is accounted unto them for righteousness). Rom. 10: Whosoever believeth in Christ is justified. 1 Tim. 6: We are to lay hold on eternal life whereunto we are also called. Phil. 3: We are to press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Matt. 11: He declares: Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest. John 6: He that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out."

In the sixth part of his "Treasury," the preface to which was written in 1586, Matthew Vogel, the faithful pupil of Luther, treats of all manner of trials, and among these also of trials "concerning God's predestination," namely "in what way Satan

* Evidently this expression is a translation of the Latin expression frequently used by our Lutheran theologians: operationi Spiritus Sancti sese submittunt — meaning the same as the "remaining passive" of Luther and the F. C.

troubles many concerning God's eternal predestination." This troubling Vogel describes as follows: "God, in His secret counsel, has chosen a little flock unto eternal life, and has predestinated the greater number unto eternal damnation. As a semblance of this the deceiving spirit misuses Christ's own words, when He declares: Many are called, but few are chosen.* And Matt. 7: Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat. Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. Since then they are among the number of the damned, all that they do will not help them, for they cannot be saved. Then the tempter also brings in Paul's words, when he writes, Rom. 9: So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. But God hath mercy on whom He will have mercy, and hardeneth whom He will harden. And the gifts and calling of God are without repentance (God does not repent of them). As He Himself declares: Surely, as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand. Is. 14." So far Vogel's description of the trials concerning predestination.

In showing how these temptations of the enemy may be met Vogel proceeds, first of all, to point to the universal gracious will of God desiring to save all men. According to the form of expression used widely in the Lutheran Church at that time he terms this the election "of men" (i. e. of all men) unto salvation. To be sure, this would make the hair of a Missourian stand on end. Here we would have — just think of it! — a Huberian before the appearance of Huber! While Samuel Huber was still quietly in his pastorate in Reformed Switzerland, a man of such importance as this theologian of the F. C., this pupil of Luther, M. Vogel, in a work so universally accepted (recommended even by Luke Osiander, the elder) — in a work spread generally among "candidates, professors, and preachers" of the

* At the Colloquium in Milwaukee (1881) the Missourians could not be induced to discuss this passage and the parables of Christ connected with it (Matth. 20 and 22). Prof. Hoenecke alone had the courage to offer his interpretation "dripping with consolation." The words meant to show, according to his opinion, "How it comes that now in time some go on this way and others go on the other" — it is according as they have either been included in the free election, or excluded from it. And how finely has Prof. Stoeckhardt evaded, up to the present day, giving an answer to our questions regarding this main passage!

Lutheran Church at that time — Vogel teaches, we say, an election of all men unto salvation! O tempora! O mores! And where now were the Missourians at that time? Yea, where were they? Had not 8000 stalwart Missourians — Missourians above all in the doctrine of predestination — just signed the 11th article of the F. C.? And the Lutheran Church (I meant to say: the Missouri Synod of that time) had it not just adopted most solemnly this its final confession, closing with the extended article on predestination and election! Had the Missouri Synod of that day no "organs" at all who could have enlightened this "Vogel" (bird) on the fact, that his bill had not a Lutheran, but a synergistic and rationalistic twist to it? How awful! How sad!

In the heading already our dear Luther-Vogel (bird) declares: "God has chosen men in Christ." His first proposition is: "Although God predestinated and ordained men unto eternal salvation before the foundation of the world." — And here the passages: "Eph. 1: God chose men before the foundation of the world. Wis. 2: And created them unto eternal life. 2 Thess. 2: And unto salvation" After now stating that God "did not keep this counsel and election secret, but revealed it in the doctrine of the Gospel," he adds: "which (Gospel) declares that God, the eternal Father, chose men through His Son Christ alone, and hence did not wish that any should be lost, but that all men should be saved through Christ." And here again passages like: "Eph. 1: God chose us men through Christ. 1 Thess. 5: And appointed us not unto wrath, but to obtain salvation. 1 Tim. 2: Who will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth. Ps. 145: The Lord is good to all. 1 John 4: And sent His Son to be the Savior of the world, etc. God therefore also, because all men have sinned, sent His Son into the world for them as a Savior, that He should suffer for the sins of all men." (In the margin: "Christ the Savior of all the world.")

"What gross Huberianism!"— all Missouri here exclaims in consternation. But, my dear sirs, do not go so fast! Neither the Word of God nor the Confession of our Church is a friend of wars and disputes about mere words.* The fact, that a writer

* The Scriptures say: "Charge them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers." 2 Tim. 2, 14; cf. 1 Tim. 6, 4. The Confession declares "that a distinction in every way should and must be observed between, on the one hand, unnecessary and useless wrangling, whereby, since it scatters more than it builds up,

speaks of the election of all men is by no means proof, that he holds a false faith or teaches false doctrine. His "mode of expression" may indeed be more or less "unfortunately chosen," defective, and wrong, and yet he may be altogether free from doctrinal error and perfectly pure in faith. Here the advice would apply: Sententiam teneat, linguam corrigat! Keep the sense, correct the language. Indeed, he may even misapply single passages of Scripture, and refer and extend what is said of believers as such, according to his idea, to all men, and still he may not at all be a false teacher, because his meaning is still scriptural and orthodox.

Our Luther-Vogel evidently understands by the election of men God's unlimited will of grace and salvation as it applies without a difference seriously and honestly to all men. As Luther, his teacher, himself said: "It is God's earnest will and opinion and command, decreed from eternity,* to save all men and to make them partakers of eternal joys, as Ezek. 18 clearly declares: God desireth not the death of a sinner, but that he may turn from his wickedness and live. If now He desires to save the sinners that live and move everywhere under the wide, high heavens, you should not allow yourselves to be separated and cut off from God's grace through your own foolish thoughts inspired by the devil. For His grace reaches and stretches from the rising to the setting sun, from noon-day unto midnight, and overshadows all who turn and are truly contrite and repentant and make themselves partakers of His mercy and seek help. . . . . (Hence we are to) remember that God Almighty created, predestinated, and also elected us,† not unto destruction, but unto

---

the Church ought not to be disturbed, and, on the other hand, necessary controversy, as when such a controversy occurs as involves the articles of faith or the chief heads of the Christian doctrine, where for the defense of the truth the false opposite doctrine must be reproved." (Mueller, 572, 15 — Jacobs' Translation, p. 538, 15.) "Also to avoid strife about words, equivocal terms, i. e. words and expressions, which may be understood and used in several senses, should be carefully and distinctly explained." (M. 584, 51 — J. 548, 51.) To these "words and expressions" belongs the term "election, predestination" and similar expressions, which are employed in an orthodox manner and yet "understood and used in several senses." He who here distinguishes best, will teach best.

* God "decreed" to save all men is an expression just as strong as: God has "chosen" them to salvation. Both expressions indeed say the same thing.

† Meaning us men, all men, as is shown by what follows.

salvation, as Paul testifies ad Ephes. (1, 4*); and we dare not begin to dispute concerning God's predestination from the Law or from reason, but from the grace of God and the Gospel which is proclaimed to all men. As the angels preached the first sermon to the shepherds in the fields, also figured in 4 parts: Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth and good will toward men. . . . Hence we are to judge and estimate these and similar thoughts concerning God's predestination from the Word of the grace and mercy of God, the Lord."

Note well, "we are to judge and estimate these and similar thoughts concerning God's predestination" from the Word of universal grace, as the Gospel reveals this grace applying to all men and extending over all. But, says Missouri, predestination is "a thing entirely different" from the universal will of grace revealed in the Gospel! The two "indeed do not harmonize," and therefore the one cannot be judged and estimated according to the other! — But what does it profit? Father Luther here tells us clearly and distinctly that our thoughts concerning the particularity of election must be judged according to the universal Word of grace. If in this he does not agree with infallible St. Louis, this may be bad for him; but his clear words cannot be garbled. He afterwards proceeds even to state how he wants this "judging and estimating" to be understood, for he tells us: "In this way you can distinguish truly and speak explicitly: If you will accept† the Gospel and the Word of God, and hold to it, and make yourself a partaker of its assurances, and adhere to this till the end, then you will be saved; if not, you will be damned in eternity, 2 Tim. 2, (12). . . . Blessed are they who govern themselves according to it, and comfort themselves by it, and adhere to it till the end, whereby we receive the grace of the Lord, if we comfort ourselves from it." (De Wette, Luther's

* Luther here states two things: not only (1) that God on His part (i. e. according to His fatherly, gracious mind) "created, predestinated, and also elected all men unto salvation"; but also (2) that Paul "testifies in Eph. 1, 4" to this. It does seem as though our dear M. Vogel had been a careful and faithful pupil of Luther. But what must here be the judgment of St. Louis in regard to Luther!

† This, in its way, is dependent even on man's conduct, as Luther declares shortly before this passage, where he writes: "Let every man sweep before his own door, then we will all be saved, and there will be no need of cudgeling our brains in regard to what God has decreed, who is to be saved and who not."

Letters, 3,355, etc.) The "correct idea" concerning predestination is, according to Luther, to be judged and concluded from the Gospel by means of a condidtional proposition: 1) If a sinner believes in Christ and perseveres to the end, he shall be saved; 2) if not, he shall be excluded from the "election unto salvation." By faith alone a man may, as far as his person is concerned, enter the election unto adoption and inheritance, or become a partaker of this election, according to the eternal decree. By unbelief alone can he remain excluded from this election, or exclude himself. For the Gospel offers Christ Himself to all men, and in Him also adoption, inheritance, election and salvation. For this reason also the Formula of Concord declares: 1) that God "determined" to receive unto adoption and inheritance of eternal life "all who accept Christ by true faith"; 2) that He "determined" in this election unto adoption and inheritance, at the same time "to save no one except those who acknowledge His Son Christ"; 3) that therefore God "directs all men to Christ as the true Book of Life, in whom they should seek election"; 4) as also this election is revealed in the Gospel (viz. John 6, 40; 3, 16); yea 5) "promised not in mere words" alone, but even "secured by an oath and sealed by the Holy Sacraments." Evidently this speaks of election as made possible for all in Christ, and as therefore also possible in regard to all men (conditionally): "If you believe, you shall be saved; if not, you remain under wrath." And since God's inmost heart and mind in its grace and love, which would have all men to be saved and would save all, here embraces all without distinction and excludes no one from "election unto salvation" by dislike, therefore Luther and many other faithful Lutheran theologians after him speak of "an election of all men" on the part of God. Something like we would say to-day: He who would gladly forgive another has really already forgiven him in his heart, namely as far as his own disposition and the thought of his heart is concerned. So also here: Since God earnestly and most heartily desires to elect and ordain unto eternal salvation in Christ, His Son, all men without exception and distinction, the one like the other, therefore, according to His own grace and love, He has excluded no one in the beginning from His election, but has left this election open for all alike, brought it nigh unto all, and on His part made it possible for them all to be actually elected. "To desire to elect all unto salvation" in the sense of "to desire heartily to ordain and predesti-

nate all unto salvation" (without the idea of selection or separation from others who are not elected) is in fact a certain kind of election, ordination, and predestination in regard to all, namely in so far as all should and can be saved "in Christ" and "through faith," as far as God's grace has to provide for their saving and can and will provide for it.

It need not, therefore, surprise us to find the expression: God has "elected men unto salvation," used frequently in the Lutheran Church prior to the adoption of the Formula of Concord, and even to some extent after its adoption before the controversy with Huber. Even then already the question was variously investigated, whether election in general should be regarded as universal or as particular. In a "Norm" of the doctrine, published in 1563, we read for instance: "All men are surely and truly elected unto eternal life by the pure grace and mercy of God through faith in Jesus Christ.*

In the following year (1564) there arose a controversy at Erfurt on the question, whether it is proper to say: All men are elected, or: only some are elected. Just think of it! In 1564, when, as we are told, Missouri's so-called "first type of doctrine" held undisputed sway throughout the Church, this question could arise in Erfurt! And who is it that defends the universality of election? In the van we find Andrew Poach, who had studied and become Magister at Wittenberg under Luther, who had then served as pastor in Halle, Jena, Nordhausen, and had been stationed at Erfurt in 1550-1572, who had also signed the F. C. at Utenbach near Jena; he died in 1585 (according to some not till 1605). Here again one of the men who, like Vogel himself, had learned to know Luther's doctrine and spirit personally by hearing him themselves, and who now found Luther's doctrine repeated faithfully in the F. C. with its strong universality of saving grace. Besides Poach, Pistorius names Magister G. Silberschlag and L. Palhofer, designating their position as the "Erfurt Ministerium." In Palhofer's defense we find the following explanations:

"We must accept no election outside of the Word, none save that which takes place through the Word; namely that God has elected, without regard to persons, those who hear His Word and

* See Piscator: Comment. in F. C. p. 473, to whom we are beholden for the following remarks. Cf. p. 654.

believe in Christ,* not by virtue of their free will, but by the power of the Holy Spirit, whom God added to the Word and gives by the Word to those who hear and pray therefor. But for those who do not hear and believe God is not to be blamed. We are told: I would, but ye would not. I have called thee by my Word; if thou hadst heard and believed my Word, thou wouldst also have been among the elect; because thou didst despise the Word, thou are reprobate."

Furthermore: "In regard to predestination, whether it is universalis or particularis, that is whether God would have all men or not all to be saved in Christ, we must not form our judgment and decision according to human reason or thoughts, nor outside of the Gospel."† "Consequently, the open and revealed predestination is not particularis, but universalis, it applies to the whole world and all men; yet it is conditionalis, conditione auditus verbi et fidei et perseverantiae sive constantiae"(i. e. it is conditional, under the condition of hearing the Word, of faith, and of perseverance or constancy). "We are told: Blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it, Luke 11. He that be-

* It appears clearly that these champions of the universality of election, before the time of Huber, did not wish to have this universality put in opposition to the election of believers as such, but only in opposition to an absolute, unconditional, regardless particularization or limitation of election. They meant to maintain the doctrine, that, according to God's will, salvation itself as well as election thereunto is intended alike for all men and open for all. And we to-day want the same thing together with the whole Lutheran Church, as it clearly confessed this truth already in the F. C. and afterwards defended it so zealously against all "covert" particularism in God's will of grace. Missouri, however, in reality destroys the universality of "electing grace" by its particularism.

† For these faithful defenders of the perfect universal will of grace the two propositions in the end mean the same thing: "God would have all men to be saved", and: "Predestination in Christ is universal", that is according to God's intention. On His part election is open for all, and in Him no particularity has been added by or according to another secret will or counsel of God. The particularity of election is based on the universal will of grace and flows of necessity from the universal counsel of salvation. He who teaches that God's will and His decree "do not harmonize', that the latter (the decree regarding the bestowal of salvation) in general "applies only to a few persons", thereby actually teaches that at bottom, speaking properly, God "would not have all men to be saved", for He would never decree their salvation! Thus, for instance Heshus wrote against the synergists: "God does not want all to be saved, for (!) He did not elect all, nor does He draw all by His grace." Alas!

lieveth and is baptized shall be saved, Mark 16. He that is faithful till the end shall be saved. Behold, this is revealed predestination: All who believe are saved; those who do not believe are damned. We speak here of God's revealed will, how God would have all men to be saved, not nude et absolutely (not simply and absolutely), but through the hearing of the Word of God and the use of the Sacraments."

In 1576 this question concerning the universality or particularity of election again became an object of controversy, this time in the Braunschweig-Lueneburg province of Prince Wolfgang, between court-preacher Rustenus, who maintained the universality, and John Sinderam and the preachers at Osterode, who attacked it. At the request of the Prince, Martin Chemnitz issued an opinion. In this opinion he begins by saying concerning the question "Whether predestination or election is universal or particular," the following: "Now as far as my person is concerned I would not, nor could I, give a categorical answer to such a bare, mutilated, dangerous question, because much is concealed behind it" (!). He then refers to the fact that in the same year (1576) at the convention in Torgau, during the discussions on the Concordia, "the same subject came up, and one man wanted to contend that predestination and election is universal, that all men are predestinated and chosen of God unto eternal salvation." Chemnitz proceeds to give the reasons why this mode of expression was not accepted, and then continues: "Besides this, at the same convention in Torgau, it was duly considered that when on the other hand, predestination is simply, and without necessary and sufficient explanation, said to be particular, or to be understood as particular, this also is dangerous, making it appear as though it were God's will and intention that He would not have all men to be saved. It is better, therefore, to avoid such bare, dangerous terms on both sides, and to speak so as not to cause offense as the article concerning predestination is explained in all simplicity in the same Formula (Concordiae)." In conclusion, he mentions that already "two years ago he heard that some in the province were contending that God's predestination and election unto eternal life belongs universally to all men, and that he who would not at once accept the paradoxical proposition was pushed out."*

* It all depends on the sense in which these defenders of the universality of election wanted to have this understood and refused to tolerate

These and similar discussions concerning the relation between "electing grace" and the particular elective decree throw an important light on the F. C. The universal counsel of grace and the special decree of salvation are not torn asunder, after the manner of Missouri, as two entirely different and contradictory things; on the contrary they were set forth as being intimately interwoven and joined together, yea, as being in a certain sense "one and the same thing." For the predestination of those who accept Christ, unto eternal life, flows naturally from the universal will of grace and constitutes (God's omniscience being added) an essential part of the universal counsel of grace. The F. C. takes as its foundation for the "idea of election" the universal will of grace, the universal redemption, and the universal call; as the essential contents of election the F. C. takes explicitly God's regard to the fact whether the called accept Christ in faith and faithfully use the grace received, or whether in conversion or perseverance they "foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in them." From the very start, therefore, election on God's part, according to the F. C., is just as open for all men as salvation itself, and all men are directed to Christ as the true "Book of Life" also for election. God earnestly desires to save all, hence also to elect all in Christ unto salvation. The elective grace of God is not in its nature a mere particular or special grace, which in itself "pertains only to some sinners," from which accordingly all others are unconditionally excluded. No; the particularity of the act of election or of the decree of election rests only on this, that God, in exercising the grace which ordains unto eternal life, looks into the future and there foresees that so many of the called "do not conduct themselves so that He can have pleasure in them," in particular that they do not permit themselves to be brought by His grace unto faith in Christ.

We now return to our dear Luther-Vogel, who as a prominent F. C. theologian strongly emphasizes the universality of "electing grace," and who therefore does not explain the limited number of the elect with Calvin and Missouri by saying, that in the case of so many millions God did not do something necessary

---

contention against it. Heshus and Hoffman in Braunschweig were indeed strict predestinarians and came out far more honestly and openly with their particularization of really saving grace than Missouri to-day dares.

for their salvation, although He "could have done it just as easily as in the case of the elect," if only He had so willed.

Vogel tells us: "As far as the passages are concerned, saying that only few are chosen, they (who are troubled) are to take these passages only as a complaint, that, although God offers His Son Christ to all men, all do not accept Him by faith, but only a few, and so the greater multitude of men exclude and separate themselves from the number of the elect through Satan's instigation and through unbelief."* (Passages: Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world. But they have not all obeyed the Gospel. Rom. 10. Many cast the Word of God away and do not account themselves worthy of eternal life. How oft would I have gathered thy children together, but ye would not.) "By all this such troubled persons should be moved to call upon God and cry unto Him more diligently, that God who called them may also work in them true faith in Christ through the preaching of the Gospel. And because God cannot and will not refuse such prayers, they should thereafter be certain from this their faith that they truly belong to the number of the elect." (Passages: Ye are the chosen generation, etc.) Since God has by no means concealed, but revealed clearly in the Gospel, that they who believe in His Son are surely the elect." (Passages: The children of the promise are counted Abraham's seed, as being of Abraham's faith, who together with Abraham believe God's promise, etc.) "All believers are God's elect"—is found in large letters in the margin, and following this, instructions how these believers are to conduct themselves, "and at the same time, as is exceed-

* When Missourians teach on the one hand, that God has not chosen so many men unto salvation only because of their unbelief, but, on the other hand, that in the actual election He did not at all look for, seek, or inquire about faith, they evidently say "Yea and Nay" in one breath. For what does it mean that God "has not chosen because of unbelief", but that He sought very closely and looked for faith, and that because He did not find the faith He sought He now also will not elect these? Or does Missouri intend in all seriousness to teach this as a most sacred Missourian mystery of faith, that also in the case of the non-elect, when it came to election, God (1) did not at all seek and inquire for their faith, but (2) did not elect them only because He did not find the faith for which He did not at all seek? Where in the Bible is this remarkable article of faith to be found? Perhaps in Paul's second Epistle to the Romans?

ingly necessary, how they should pray to God that He may graciously keep them in the number of the elect."*

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

We have, according to the best of our knowledge and ability, introduced the powerful testimony of the faithful F. C. theologians of our Church as fully as possible. It is true, the voice of our Church, taking it formally and in an officially authentic way, is only the Confession itself. If now, however, after 300 years of unanimity in understanding this Confession on the part of the Lutheran Church, a bad controversy arises and a fanatical party makes its appearance in the Church, which with lofty mien and derisive side-glance upon the poor "fathers fallen from the Scriptures and the Symbol" presumptuously asserts that now it has discovered and brought to light the only "genuine," correct sense of the Lutheran Confession from out of the infinite rubbish covering it hitherto, then assuredly it is time to go back to the Church which adopted the Confession itself and made this Confession its own. Common sense will demand this in such a case. If it can be demonstrated that a congregation, synod, or church held to a certain interpretation of certain points of a document, which it adopted as an expression of its meaning or of its faith, then this demonstrable sense is in reality the sense of the Confession in the mouth of this church on the point concerned. Even if the words and sentences, as they stand in the confession itself, could be taken in a different sense, this will not be the sense of the confession in the mouth of the church which adopted the confession and for 300 years understood, in-

* Compare with this earlier "type of doctrine", which simply declares: "He that believeth is God's elect child", the F. C. in many passages where believers and elect are spoken of as the same persons and the two words are taken as synonymous. Mueller, p. 610, 2 (cf. 4 and 16). — 622, 54. — 641, 6 (cf. 4. 7. 9). — 532, 13. 14 (cf. 10. 11. 19). — 711, 31. — 719, 73. — 715, 50. — The same passages are found in Jacobs' Translation, p 570, 2 (cf. 4 and 16). — 579, 54. — 596, 6 (cf. 4. 7. 9). — 505, 13. 14 (cf. 10. 11. 19). — 655, 31. — 622, 73. — 658, 50. — As also Missouri still sings:

> "I rejoice that I still remain
> In Thy elect body
> A living rib."
>
> (Verse 3 of : "Wie schoen leucht't" etc.)

terpreted, and defended it in essentially the same sense and signification. We do not by this admit that the language of the Confession actually has or can have a sense different from that which the F. C. theologians themselves and their faithful pupils and followers found in it. On the contrary, for ourselves we are firmly convinced that the Confession itself, when it is not arbitrarily cut up, and its separate parts torn from their connection are not pressed in a onesided way, but when the whole of it according to all its parts is reviewed and judged in its unity, contains exactly the doctrine which the F. C. theologians themselves, as also their faithful followers, set forth as the doctrine of the Lutheran Church and as the sense of the Lutheran Confession. Missouri, however, selects its proof passages from the Confession arbitrarily as they best fit her purpose, and fails entirely to consider the other passages as also the real intention (scopus) of the Confession. Here now we appeal to the "fathers" and say: It will not do to put a doctrine into the Confession of which the Church at that time knew nothing and wanted to know nothing, a doctrine which this very Church according to its unanimous testimony rejected and assailed as Calvinistic and false; we protest in the name of the Lutheran Church against interpreting her Confession otherwise than she herself understood and interpreted it at the time of its adoption and 300 years thereafter. And no authoritative declarations, no strokes of violence will change the facts. The true sense, the genuine and correct sense of the 11th article of the F. C. is not the sense which some great or small personage of the 19th century may construe out of it or interpret into it, but the simple sense which the Lutheran Church at the time and since that time actually connected with this article and set forth and defended as its true meaning. What, for instance, might not be set up as the sense of the 10th article of the Augsburg Confession (especially of the words: "under the form of bread and wine"!), if the contemporaneous testimony of the Church did not furnish the clearest documentary proof of what was then meant by these words? And the same thing applies to many another case.

Hence Grauer already declared, and his words are fully justified: "The Calvinists would like to interpret the sense of the Augsburg Confession according to the doctrinal opinions of its author, Phil. Melanchthon. But why this? Philip was

no Calvinist at this time. The sense of the Augsburg Confession is that which was publicly heard at the time in the churches of the Protestants."* We to-day say the same thing in regard to the sense and meaning of the 11th article of the F. C.: That is the genuine, correct, and only valid sense and meaning of the 11th article as a Lutheran Confession concerning predestination, which was heard publicly at that time in the schools and churches, in the universities and published writings of the F. C. theologians and congregations. Defiance to Missouri and its haughty reformation! What can it say? Will it say: "O, dear people, the theologians and churches of that time were still far behind as concerns a clear view of this difficult doctrine; a man like Pieper now, like Stoeckhardt, to say nothing of Dr. Walther in the capacity of Chief Reformer of Lutheran orthodoxy knows far better what was the orthodox sense of the Confession which the Church then adopted; the Church at that time was simply mistaken in this matter; whether you take Rostock with its aged Chytræus as the last co-author of the Confession, or Tuebingen with Andreæ as the most prominent author of this article, or Wittenberg, or Leipzig, or Jena, or Marburg, or Strassburg, all indeed otherwise altogether honorable 'organs' of the Church, to say nothing of a large number of individuals, but — they have one and all simply misunderstood their solemn Confession; what they conceived to be the sense of the Confession and meant to subscribe was not its real sense at all; on the contrary, the actual sense of the Symbol they adopted and subscribed was a doctrine which they (alas!), having already 'fallen away from the Scriptures and the Symbol,' assailed and rejected." — It may be that Missouri sprinkles odorous frankincense for itself and its church-idols in such stinking boasts. This is a matter of taste. We continue to remember John 5, 21, and prefer not to take part in such apings of Luther, holding to this: "The sense of the 11th article of the F. C. is that which was publicly heard at that time from one end of the Lutheran Church to the other."†

The subsequent Church merely followed in the footsteps of the F. C. theologians themselves, and, as far as the substance of the doctrine is concerned, did not add or modify away one

* Is est sensus Augustanae Confessionis, qui tum tempori sonabat publice in Ecclesiis Protestantium. Praelect. in A. C. p 1.

† Fiat justitia, pereat mundus! (Right must ever remain right.)

mite of it. Especially in the great cardinal question, whether God elected and ordained unto salvation sinners as such — i. e. still lying by nature altogether in the universal depravity, like all the rest still beheld without repentance, without faith, and without perseverance — or sinners as believers in the Savior, on this the F. C. theologians and the subsequent "fathers" and the Confession are in perfect agreement. Not the slightest deviation can be detected. The controversy with Huber furnished direct occasion for ventilating this question especially. Not satisfied with the ready admission from the Lutheran standpoint that God would save, and in so far also elect, all men, and that this had been hitherto now and then after his manner termed a universal election of all men, and could still be so termed without heresy, Huber wanted to assert an absolute universal election, and denied completely and assailed election or selection in the proper sense of the word, namely the decree of God, to save those believing in Christ through His merit.

We have, accordingly, in the controversy with Huber a test case as to how the Church of the F. C. understood the 11th article on the question concerning the relation between election and faith. To be sure, it can be shown clearly also from the other writings of the Lutheran theologians of that time, from volumes of sermons, expositions of the Epistle to the Romans, of the Epistle to the Ephesians, etc., especially from polemical writings against the Calvinists, what doctrine of election was then publicly taught in churches and schools. Huber, however, was a Lutheran, and had left the Reformed just because of Calvin's doctrine of predestination. He was even professor at Wittenberg, the cathedra Lutheri, by the side of the chief champion of the Lutheran faith at that time, Ægidius Hunnius. Huber, moreover, was not only known and respected far and wide as a competent and valiant defender of the Lutheran truth over against Calvinistic error, he also traveled over the whole of Lutheran Germany for the purpose of securing adherents and friends for his doctrine. The entire Lutheran Church, which had made the F. C. its confession only 12 years before this time, saw itself imperatively compelled to make a declaration, through the persons of its known representatives, most of whom had signed the F. C. with their own hands, in regard to the sense of the Confession and the faith of the Church. The aged Chytræus, the only one of the six co-authors of the F. C. still living,

conferred personally with Huber and left us his clear, direct testimony on the question concerning the relation between election and faith. Thousands of the original signers of the F. C. still live; all, who have anything to say in regard to Huber, agree perfectly with Chytræus and Backmeister in Rostock, with Hunnius and Leyser in Wittenberg, with Gerlach and Hafenreffer in Tuebingen, as the chief opponents of Huber. Nowhere do we hear the slightest contradiction, unless we take the utterances of Daniel Hoffmann in Helmstaedt, who, however, had already renounced the F. C. long before this. Instead of criticising Hunnius from the Missourian standpoint of a particular grace of election, for ascribing too much to faith when he makes the elective separation of persons unto salvation depend on faith, the very opposite takes place. In anti-Calvinistic zeal some are inclined here and there to favor Huber, they excuse his position and put the best possible construction upon it, they even emphasize with great earnestness the very truths which Huber in his fanatic way set forth in a onesided way and placed in contradiction to other doctrines, so that he imagined he had to reject the latter because of the former.

It was Huber's intention to destroy the very root, the Calvinistic particularism, which had been established and developed far and wide. He, accordingly, emphasized universal grace so exceedingly and so onesidedly as to not only call this grace, without further explanation, a universal election of all men on the part of God (as others had done before him, and which might have been permitted as an improper expression), but even so as to deny that God had at all chosen believers in a special sense, and that there existed a special divine decree of election applying only to believers as such. There is only one divine decree of election, he taught, only one act of election on the part of God, and this decree or act simply applies in Christ to all men without distinction. By this he did not mean to say that non-believers would also be saved since they too had been chosen and ordained unto salvation. Huber held fast that believers alone are saved, since they alone become personal partakers of Christ's universal merit and of universal election. But he would not place in God a special decree referring only to believers, or to their faith, or to Christ's merit as embraced by faith. In God, he claimed, everything remains absolutely universal and equal, and, consequently, there can be

no "subsequent will," no particular decree of salvation, least of all a special selection on God's part for the saving of certain individual persons (i. e. believers).

Imagine now what Lutheran theologians and churches would have had to say in reply to Huber, if they had understood and interpreted the Scriptures and the Confession after the fashion of Missouri, if they had taught in harmony with Calvinism an election unto salvation without foreseen regard to future faith. In truth, if Hunnius and Gerlach had taken this doctrine to oppose Huber, if they had emphasized a selective election of persons unto certain salvation independent of faith, it would not have been at all impossible for Huber, like Flacius before him, to have drawn at least for a time the majority of the F. C. theologians to his side. For in the writings of that day it appears that the Lutheran Church, especially since the Mœmpelgart discussion (1586), turned with abhorrence and indignation from the Calvinistic particularity of elective grace and filled its heart with the universality of the 11th article of its Confession. The true middle path would then indeed have been between Huber and his opponents, and doubtless would have been generally accepted at last through the grace of God. But this correct middle path between Huber's false universalism and Missouri's worse particularism all the opponents of Huber in the Lutheran Church, all the theologians of the F. C. Church did at once adopt. They did not object so much to Huber's speaking of a certain election of all men; they only opposed his calling this a selection in the proper and strict sense of the word, and then especially his denying the real proper election of "God's children, of believers as such, and his assailing this as Calvinistic particularism. In numberless places those of Rostock, of Wittenberg and Wuertemberg point to the fact, that the F. C. speaks explicitly of the election of certain persons, which "pertains only to the children of God," who are none but believers. And just as frequently they point to the words of the Epitome: "In Christ we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who, in His eternal divine counsel, determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him." In these words they found the election of persons clearly joined to faith. An election unto salvation, which excludes from the ordination unto salvation all those who do not believe in Christ, could not possibly apply to sinners "without faith," either

to all, or only to some. The fact, that at the moment of election they appear to God's eyes as having no faith, would necessitate the result, that they could not be chosen, if God really followed the principle in His eternal election, that "He would save no one except those who believe on His Son." He, therefore, who was regarded as "without faith" was excluded from election; he on the other hand, who was not excluded, but included in this election, must have belonged then already, at the moment of election, to the number of those (i. e. must have been foreseen as belonging to them) who "acknowledge Christ and truly believe on Him." Although this sentence is negative and gives the reason, why so many of the called are not chosen, it nevertheless contains the clear and positive rule: He who is actually to be chosen in the eternal election of the Father must (according to God's foresight) be one who does not reject Christ in unbelief, but accepts Him in faith. In short, the real selective separation of those persons who alone are to be saved cannot be conceived as having taken place without the foreknowledge of God respecting the future faith of certain persons, nor can it be placed before God's foreknowledge respecting faith and unbelief; on the contrary, as far as the thought of time is concerned, it is connected with this foreknowledge, and as far as logical order is concerned, it has taken place "after God's foreknowledge respecting faith" (i. e. really "for the sake of Christ's merit as embraced by faith"). "He that believes shall be saved" is the order of election and the rule of election. Those individuals, called by the Gospel, whom God foresaw as believing in Christ, He included in His election unto salvation as persons who "shall be saved." Those, however, of whom God foresaw that they do not "acknowledge His Son, Christ, and believe on Him," He excluded from election. The cause and explanation of all this is the fact, that He "will save no one except those who believe."

This is how the Church at that time understood its Confession. It found Huber's doctrine clearly rejected therein, not so much because Huber in general taught a certain kind of universal election, but because he denied the election of believers in Christ, which was clearly declared in the Confession. These are the simple historical facts.

Missouri may indeed consider this conception of the 11th article on the part of the F. C. Church false and erroneous, a

"misunderstanding" of the Symbol, false doctrine, etc. Yet it will not be able thereby to alter in the least the historical fact, that the entire Lutheran Church, as far as it then expressed itself as the original F. C. Church in the Huber controversy, actually and unanimously had this and no other conception of its Confession. The thing that Missouri claims to find in the Confession, a complete election unto salvation, pertaining not to believers as such, but to persons "still lying with the rest in their general depravity," this the F. C. theologians did not find in the Confession; on the contrary, they rejected this doctrine repeatedly as a Calvinistic, yea heathen, and wicked doctrine. The thing that these men found taught in the Confession, an election of believers as such, this Missouri to-day is unable to find there, and it rejects this doctrine as antiscriptural and antisymbolical, yea it brands our Lutheran fathers on account of this doctrine as men who have "deviated from the Scriptures and the Symbol"!! This very "Intuitu fidei theory," which Missouri reviles and derides as a piece of synergistic Pelagian heresy, was the exact doctrine of election which the F. C. theologians in Mecklenburg, Brandenburg, Saxony, Hessia, Wuertemberg, etc. maintained as scriptural and confessional over against Huber and the Calvinists, and found taught clearly and distinctly in the F. C., only recently adopted by them and subscribed with their own hands. The Missourian Calvinistic particularity of "elective grace," on the other hand, was entirely alien to them. According to them "elective grace" was not in itself something particular, something pertaining in general only to a few sinners, just as little as this was the case with calling, justifying, and in general saving grace; but only the elective act or the decree of election was particular. And this, to be sure, for the reason, that God, who desired to elect and ordain all men unto salvation, if only they would believe in Christ, would not elect or ordain unto salvation a single person without faith, as also the Confession itself clearly declares. For Missouri, however, the grace of election and the election of grace is one and the same thing, and both pertain only to certain sinners considered as still without repentance and faith, pertaining to them, however, in such a way as to include in the infallible decree of salvation at the same time an infallible (one that "executes itself" in spite of their wilful and wicked resistance) decree of conversion and perseverance. Of course, for evident reasons Missouri does not

like to say an "irresistible decree of conversion and salvation"; yet it substitutes a word that means the same thing: "election executes itself" — independent of everything good or evil, even of wilful, obstinate, wicked conduct. But this very particularism and absolutim of grace our F. C. men opposed on the part of Calvinists as "unchristian and heathenish," and, of course, had to suffer their own doctrine to be slandered under the name of Pelagianism; so that it is perfectly in order when Calvinizing Missouri to-day reviles the doctrine of these F. C. men held by us as synergistic and Pelagian. That which is bred in the bone, will never out of the flesh.

If there is one spark of honesty in St. Louis — which we doubt much because of their ceaseless lying and slander*— it is their turn now to come to a settlement with these historical facts. How did the Lutheran Church, only 12 years after the adoption of the 11th article, attain, in the south and in the north, in the east and in the west, this unanimous conception and confession of the doctrine of election, which was taught in opposition to Huber in all the acknowledged orthodox universities and defended in the polemical publications of all important subscribers to the F. C.? Did all these men — Hunnius, Leyser, Mirus, Loner, Mylius, Heerbrand, Osiander, Magirus, Biedem-

* From the very start of the controversy Dr. Walther, for instance, repeatedly represented matters as though the point at issue between him and ourselves was the same as that between Huber and the "acknowledged orthodox" theologians of Wittenberg and Tuebingen. As though he and his adherents were defending the doctrine of Hunnius, Gerlach, Leyser, etc. against us, while we were defending Huber's doctrine against Missouri. He also repeatedly referred to the fact that Huber had already accused these "acknowledged orthodox" theologians of Calvinism, so that it was not at all strange, when he and his adherents, as followers of these "acknowledged orthodox" theologians, were in the same way accused of Calvinism. But then already Dr. W. knew that neither we were defending Huber's doctrine, nor he that of Huber's opponents. He knew that the doctrine of election in view of faith, maintained by the men of Wittenberg and of Tuebingen, is precisely our doctrine, and that in this whole trouble with Missouri we meant to hold fast, and actually did hold fast, nothing but what these "acknowledged orthodox" men of Wittenberg and Tuebingen, these champions among the original subscribers to the F. C., had victoriously maintained over against Huber as well as over against the Calvinists. For these and the great majority of all the other signers of the F. C. were still living when this doctrine of God's Word, now ridiculed by Walther and his adherents as the "Intuitu Fidei theory", and condemned as a deviation from the Scriptures and the Symbol, was taught

bach, Holder, Binder, Gerlach, Arcularius, Backmeister, Chytræus, Coler, Francisci — did all these original signers of the F. C. understand the sense of the 11th article in such an entirely wrong way, when they examined this article and solemnly signed it as the confession of their own faith? Or did they perhaps agree with the Confession in 1580 when it was published in their name and with their signatures as the confession of the Lutheran Church, and had they now, alas, in 1592, come to change their minds and one and all fallen away from the Confession they had signed in the name of the Church? Not one of them brought in the Missourian idea of the relation between election and faith, in this controversy with Huber! Not one of them teaches that the "Intuitu fidei theory," emphasized so strongly by Hunnius and Gerlach, is not the doctrine of the Scriptures, not the doctrine of the F. C., not the confession of the Lutheran Church! These men are the acknowledged representatives of the Lutheran doctrine and Church at the very time when this Church adopted the F. C. as its confession of faith. They themselves took an active, prominent part in the adoption of the Confession, signing it as the "organs" of the Church in her name. Is now the doctrine which these men, according to their subsequent unanimous statement, found expressed in the Confession and

---

universally in the Lutheran Church and acknowledged as according to the Scriptures and the Symbol. Indeed, Dr. Walther knew that, if he compared the present doctrinal controversy to that of Huber, the case would be this: The very doctrine of election unto salvation in view of faith in Christ, which Huber at that time rejected and opposed as Pelagianizing, and which Huber's opponents held fast as scriptural and confessional and maintained victoriously, is to-day opposed by Missouri with the same specious arguments, and on the other hand maintained by us "opponents" with the same victorious weapons All this Dr. W. knew and knows now as perfectly as any man could know it. In spite of this he again recently dared to identify the doctrine of his opponents with that of Huber, describing it as "a heresy, which had been victoriously opposed and rejected long ago in our Church, already in the 16th century", and then proceeding to recommend himself and his brethren in the faith as the true successors of these orthodox Lutherans. If there is such a thing as a "conscious lie", if there have ever been in rerum natura conscious lies, then this presentation by Dr. Walther of the point at issue in the present controversy is such a lie. And what is far worse, hundreds of his people stand by and see this poor man placing his soul's eternal salvation in jeopardy by open lying, and not one of them possesses courage enough to tell him to his face, for his soul's good, that such conscious liars cannot inherit the kingdom of God. May God have mercy on them!

which they signed and published as the actual faith of the Lutheran Church, is this really the doctrine of the Confession? Or did the Confession contain a different meaning and a different doctrine? And was the faith of the Church in whose name they put down their signatures really different? How was it! Answer!

Another thing. Besides those named, whose unanimous testimony we have given at length, the great majority of the other subscribers were still living when the controversy with Huber was fought out and the doctrine of the election of believers as such was universally acknowledged as that of the Lutheran Church and of the Confession.* Why did none of all these lift up his voice, if now, so short a time after the adoption of the F. C., a deviation from the Symbol in one of the important fundamental doctrines was taking place? Were they all "dumb dogs," cowardly "ducking their heads" on account of the prominence of men like Hunnius and Leyser, denying the divine truth they had just confessed publicly? We can name a long line

* When St. Louis continues to say that the "later dogmaticians of the 17th century" invented the "Intuitu fidei theory", or at least gave it general currency in the Lutheran Church, this is again one of those gross falsehoods, spread for the purpose of making it appear that after all the Lutheran Church at the time of the F. C., and for some thirty or forty years thereafter, really knew nothing of this "theory". Hutter and Gerhard are the first two prominent representatives of the "later dogmaticians." They were pupils almost entirely of subscribers to the F. C., and in the earlier years of their activity contemporaries and co-laborers of such subscribers. Gerhard's Locus de Praedestinatione was published almost every word as we find it now, already in 1607 at Coburg, eight years before he entered Jena as professor. Hutter's "Exposition of the F. C." was published in 1609. Both of these works do indeed contain the "Intuitu fidei doctrine, in full form. Hutter in his "Exposition of the F. C." brings this doctrine ex professo as that of the Lutheran Confession. Certainly several thousand of the 8000 original subscribers were still living, perhaps more than half of them. Not a single one raised his voice to rescue the genuine sense of the Confession from the perversions of this falsifier! ! But the chief question is still: Where was the church which ever adopted the Confession in the Missourian sense, when the whole host of original subscribers, as quoted by us, in Rostock, in Wittenberg, in Leipzig, in Brandenburg, in Tuebingen, in Marburg, declared unanimously shortly afterwards that they had subscribed the doctrine of the particular election of believers as such in the Confession as the faith and confession of the Lutheran Church and subscribed it in her name? Where did these Missourian subscribers keep themselves during all these years of controversy with Huber? In Utopia?

of subscribers to the F. C. who certainly survived the controversy with Huber (1592-98), some of whom did not depart this life until the pupils of the F. C. men — of Hutter, Meisner, Menzer, Gerhard, etc. — had reached their prime. Compare, for instance, the date of death of the following subscribers: Z. Schilter, 1604; Sigfried Saccus, 1596; Ph. Heilbrunner, 1616; Cyr. Schneegas, 1597; B. Sattler, 1624; V. Schacht, 1607; John Brenz, Jr., 1595; John Wesenbeck, 1612; John Stecher, 1611; A. Vinarius, 1606; J. Schmidlin, 1600; Jac. Schropp, 1594; H. Rentz, 1601; M. Hægelin, 1631; J. Esthofer, 1606; C. Sautter, 1604; N. Wielandt, 1617; A. Grammer, 1612; J. Hutzelin, 1621; J. Assum, 1619; W. Mægling, 1602; H. Frey, 1599; J. Weininger, 1629; Caspar Lutz, 1602; J. Andreæ, 1601; Ph. Greter, 1612; Th. Byrk, 1615; Israel Wielandt, 1633; J. Schopf, 1621; B. Morgenstern, 1599; Conrad Schluesselburg, 1619;* Jer. Pistor, 1613; John Piscarius, 1601; G. Vollmer, 1611; S. Nauheuser, 1595; Chr. Hermann, 1612; C. Platz, 1595. This already is quite a fine number of theologians so important and well-known that with our limited means we are able to give the date of their death. What sense did these men connect with the 11th article of the F. C. when they signed it? That which Hunnius, Leyser, Chytræus, etc., upheld over against Huber, or that which Missouri now imagines to have discovered? Or were they all such miserable hirelings, that they permitted the "synergistic" wolf to ravage as he pleased in the Lutheran fold? — who knew very well that the doctrine of Hunnius, Gerlach, etc. (the "Intuitu fidei theory") is not taught in the Confession, yea is even indirectly rejected therein and branded as a fundamentally false, blasphemous "error, not to be tolerated in the Church," but who in spite of all this one and all remained as still as mice, when it came to the point of opposing this "falling away" from the Confession?! Did they really all shortly before this solemnly confess the truth as Missourians, and now deny it, many of them for years, by their cowardly silence in the face of prevailing error?

We, of course, need not answer all these questions. But if St. Louis has still a spark of honesty left, then let it come to an

---

* A man like Conrad Schluesselburg, born 1543, author of Catalogus Haereticorum in nine volumes, would surely have bestirred himself, if he had detected synergistic filth or a deviation from the Scriptures and the Symbol in the doctrine of predestination as taught by Hunnius and others! Or was he asleep from 1592-1619?

open and honest settlement with these facts. The sense of the 11th article is and shall forever remain that which the original subscribers, who signed it with their own hands, attached to its language, when in the name of their churches and schools they signed the Formula. What this sense really was they themselves have shown us by their own documents in the most indubitable way. This settles the whole thing!

Yet — great, great is Diana of the Missourians! This new goddess of the chase has slain strange game in tracking synergism and has executed a wonderful shot of revelation. She has discovered altogether anew the "genuine" sense of the Formula of Concord — this we have to admit, for hitherto not even the original subscribers and authors, to say nothing of the later church which had "deviated from the Scriptures and the Symbol," knew anything of this sense of the Formula. After 300 years St. Louis has hit upon what is the "genuine" sense of F. C., of which not only the later dogmaticians, but even the original subscribers in the name of the Church had no inkling. This is the master shot, the king's shot! Great is Diana of the Missourians!

C. THE IMMEDIATE PUPILS OF THE SUBSCRIBERS OF THE FORMULA OF CONCORD.

INTRODUCTION.

We read in the Report of the Western District of the Missouri Synod for the year 1858, p. 17: "The question is asked: 'Is it not absolutely necessary to take the Symbols in none but their historical sense?' I answer: To be sure, if correctly understood; if our meaning is this, that history furnishes the necessary light for understanding 'how the Holy Scriptures were understood and interpreted in disputed articles in the church by those then living, and how the contrary doctrine was rejected and condemned.' "

Surely a principle altogether correct. Even as regards the Holy Scriptures we cannot do without historical exposition; for he who would fail in his explanation of the Scriptures to take account of the circumstances and condition of affairs at that time, who would take and interpret everything as though it were written to-day, would in many instances put the greatest nonsense into the Scriptures. The Jews, for instance, would then be quite right in still looking for the Messiah to-day.

If now there arises a dispute concerning a symbol of the church, whether it be one of the ecumenical or one of the specifically Lutheran symbols, because certain expressions or sentences are understood and interpreted differently, the only correct way to decide which conception of the symbol is correct is to go back to the church which adopted and set up the symbol as the confession of its faith. If one were to form his judgment of the confession in such a case merely according to the present use of language, or according to some earlier or later form of expression, he would very likely find something entirely different in the confession from that which the confession itself meant.

This bad mistake is made by Missouri in regard to the 11th article. Even if the Confession contained the sentence in so many words: "Election is the cause of faith," this would not at all be enough to decide that the Missourian doctrine of election as a

cause of faith is really the confessional doctrine of our Church. It is a fact that the word "election" has been taken in different senses, and the question would then be: What is the correct historical interpretation of this sentence? If it can be demonstrated that the Church at that time, according to its general use of language and according to the explanation of the sense of its Confession, set forth election proper, or the separation of all those persons who alone are to be saved, as depending on future faith, or on the appropriated merit of Christ, then it is an unhistorical, and for this reason altogether objectionable, interpretation of the Confession to find this election throughout set forth as being independent of faith. Even if, judging according to later usage of language, one would be compelled to find in the Confession an election unto salvation independent of faith, it would nevertheless be foolish in the highest degree on this account to impute such a doctrine to the Confession. To be sure, it may not exactly suit Missouri to take the historical sense of the Confession, i. e. to find exactly the same sense in the Confession, and understand and interpret it in strictly the same way, as it was understood and interpreted by those then living, by the original subscribers, by the contemporaneous Church. But right must still be right, also in this respect. The true and only correct, authentic, ecclesiastically valid sense of the Confession is none other than that connected with this article by the Church which subscribed and adopted the Confession.

What the faith was that lived in the hearts of the Church at that time, what the doctrine was then publicly and generally taught from the lecture desk and the pulpit, in devotional books and in polemical writings as contained in the Confession, and acknowledged as Lutheran doctrine by friend and foe, the testimonies we have furnished from the immediate subscribers of the F. C. have shown us sufficiently. But besides these the theologians that grew up in the F. C. Church as pupils of the first subscribers are a still further powerful testimony against Missouri's unjustifiable perversion of the Confession. To be sure, if it is taken for granted that already the original subscribers themselves, who as organs of the Church at that time made the Confession the symbol of the Church, unfortunately "misunderstood" it, or that only a few years after they one and all "deviated from the Scriptures and the Symbol," then indeed it will also be assumed that their pupils grew up in this antiscriptural and antisymbolical "syner-

gistic Pelagian" doctrine and themselves promulgated it. And yet it would be remarkable that not one of these pupils of the F. C. men knows anything about a different conception of the Confession! The Missouri Synod has now been established some 40 years (this was written in 1884 — Tr.). At the time of its origin the doctrines concerning the church and the ministry were so to say in a fluid state. In 1852 the Synod adopts the theses presented by Dr. Walther in the "Voice of Our Church." If now, some 40 or 50 years after the founding of the Missouri Synod, there should arise a question, as to how this or that main point in the theses referred to is to be understood as the symbol of the Missouri Synod, should not, in addition to the writings of the original Missourians, the testimony of their immediate pupils be taken in evidence? And if everything is found to harmonize completely, if the testimony of the entire multitude is unanimous and of one accord, would not he be a fool who refuses to yield in this purely historical question, and in defiance of all the facts is determined to stick to the foolish notions in his own head?

This is exactly the case in regard to the F. C. To us the years 1580 and 1620 may appear to be widely separated. They were no farther apart than are 1846 and 1886. In 1609 many of the original 8,000 subscribers were still living and would have rapped the rising generation sharply over the knuckles, if it had attempted to introduce a false doctrine of predestination and to make it appear that this was contained in the Confession. And in fact it is altogether inconceivable that Huber's doctrine alone should have caused such a commotion in the Church, if the doctrine of Hunnius and others had likewise been a deviation from the Confession. Surely, some one would have found himself compelled to say: Thou hypocrite, Hunnius, Leyser, Gerlach, etc., cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye! Still, we again recall the possibility that the subscribers of the F. C. one and all either misunderstood the 11th article from the very beginning, or in the meantime had fallen away from its teaching. A Missourian may for evident reasons find this sort of thing conceivable.

LEONHARD HUTTER.

Among the immediate pupils of the theologians of the Formula of Concord we introduce to begin with Leonhard Hutter. He was born in 1563 in Nellingen near Ulm; he studied in Strassburg under Pappus, at Leipzig under Selnecker and Schilter, at Jena under G. Mylius. At the latter place he received the title of Doctor of Theology (in 1593), Mylius presiding; the subject of his disputation for the degree was predestination. In 1596 he received a professorship at Wittenberg beside Hunnius and Gesner; he died in 1616. The letters of his name Leonardus Hutterus were flatteringly rearranged to read Redonatus Lutterus (Luther returned). His most important work is the large Loci Theologici, where we find the following:

"This is the complete elaboration of the order of election:* Christ and His merit, only when appropriated by faith, constitutes the order of election. It is in this way that the second part of the order, by being added to the first, limits the universality and effective power of Christ's merit only to those who believe, that is as far as its saving fruit is concerned. On this point now Huber raises a disturbance and inquires anxiously, in what manner and with what right faith can be a constituent of the eternal decree of election, and whether faith is to be termed a cause of election. But he only creates difficulties where there are none. For why should we doubt what the Scriptures declare explicitly, as was shown heretofore (from Eph. 1, 1 and 12; 2 Thess. 2, 13; Tit. 1, 1; James 2, 5). But that this part of our elaboration may be the clearer, we will proceed to explain it as it were part by part according to its several members. First of all it is sufficiently clear from what has been said that the condition and presence of faith must be called a part of the divine order within which the decree of election is as it were included according to God's will. This, however, does not prevent faith from being called at times and in its way also a cause of election. For the common rule is true: The causes of election are the same as those of justification. And it is an incontrovertible truth, that the causes, by means of which God, in the execution of His eternal purpose,

* For the proper understanding of his words we note that in the preceding passage Hutter divided the order of election into two parts: 1) "The first place belongs to Christ, the Savior, and His merit"; 2) "The second part of this order is faith, which appropriates Christ's merit; in our day this part has called out the severest contentions."

saves men in time, are the same as those through which He determined from eternity to save men. Now men are saved in time: by the mercy of God, for the sake of the Mediator Christ, who is appropriated by faith. Hence we must take it that their salvation has been determined from eternity by means of these same causes (among them also faith), or, what amounts to the same thing, that their election took place by means of these same causes. Huber indeed declares that it tastes of Pelagianism to say, faith in this sense enters election as a cause. But he falls into the fallacy of confounding the causes, and moreover draws illogical conclusions. For, aside from the fact, that we readily admit, faith is a gift of God, bestowed in pure unmerited grace, it is not at all asserted in regard to faith that it is a meritorious cause of election, for the sake of which, or for the sake of the worthiness of which, eternal election took place. On the contrary, it is claimed that faith is only an organic or instrumental cause, and that election took place not for the sake of its worthiness or for the sake of its merit, but only that it was effected in the order of faith. Hence just as in the act of justification faith is only regarded relatively (RELATE), namely as relating to Christ, so also in the mystery of election. If, accordingly, faith could not enter the decree of election for the reason, that it is an unmerited gift, then for the same reason it would have to be excluded from justification, and this would be altogether false. Similarly the expression: 'Faith is a cause of election in respect to the order,' must not be understood as though we meant to say (as the Calvinists slanderously attribute to us*) that men ordained themselves unto eternal life, which would be Pelagian; but our meaning is that men follow the order established by God, so that they are ordained not by themselves, but by God. They are ordained, however, partly in respect to the call of the Gospel, wherein God anticipates all human endeavor, and partly in respect to faith itself, which the Holy Spirit enkindles in man through the Word that is heard" (p. 801).

"Properly speaking, God foreknows nothing, having from all eternity everything future before Him as most completely present. He thus foreknew, yea as it were saw before Him, that some among men would submit themselves to the divine order (sese ordini divino attemperaturos) through faith in Christ (in

* The same thing is true of Missourians who are equally inclined to slander.

whose order it pleased Him from eternity to elect men), i. e. would truly believe. . . . God, however, foreknew not merely in a general way that some men would believe, but He foreknew exactly which single, separate persons, each considered individually, would believe and when they would believe. Faith, therefore, is not considered, in this matter of eternal election, as an actuality and as a fact, as already present, enkindled by the Holy Ghost in man's heart, which of course could only take place in time;* on the contrary (faith is taken into consideration), because, for one thing, it belongs to the order and to the decree of predestination or of God electing, and for another thing, because it is an object of His eternal foreknowledge.† And this doctrine has nothing in common with the idle notion of the scholastics concerning foreseen works in view of which God is said to have chosen us. For there is a great difference here. In the first place, faith is not regarded here as a virtue, a quality, or a kind of work, but only in so far as it is related to Christ's merit (quatenus relate se habet ad meritum Christi). Besides this, faith as appropriating Christ's merit does not contradict grace, but is subordinate to it. Works, however, are as incompatible with grace in this article as in that of justification, for these two (grace and works) exclude one another; as the apostle teaches: If we have been chosen through grace, it was not of works, otherwise grace would no longer be grace; but if it was of works, then it was not by grace, otherwise works would no longer be works. Rom. 11, 6. Since orthodox theologians keep this in mind, they justly repel the expression: 'We are elected for the sake of faith.' which silently presumes merit on our part. But we say with the Scriptures: 'We are elected through (PER) faith or in faith in Jesus Christ.' And this is exactly the same sense as we are accustomed to use the same expression in the article of justification. 2 Thess. 2, 15: En pistei aletheias." (Page 802.)

Missouri, however, has been for years opposing precisely this, that in the election of persons unto the certain attainment

* In this way faith can be taken into consideration only when it actually exists, for instance in justification and in the bestowal of salvation.

† According to Hutter, therefore, faith belongs to election, 1) because God's will and order regarding election is this: He alone who believes in Christ through the grace offered him shall be elected unto life; 2) because God foreknew every single believing person as such, and actually also elected each according to His will and the order of His election. Later writers analysed this into the Syllogismus Praedestinatorius.

of salvation faith in Christ, on the one hand, is not taken into consideration (namely as a merit, work, virtue, good quality, etc.), and, on the other hand, is still taken into consideration (namely in respect to Christ and as the only means on man's part for partaking personally of Christ's universal merit) in the same way as in justification and the bestowal of salvation in time. Faith, they say, merely flows from election, is only a result and fruit of election, since God has chosen certain sinners without faith, according to His secret good pleasure (arcanum libitum), unto salvation itself and in the same way also unto faith. To teach an election "out of (foreseen) faith unto (actual) faith" would be altogether correct. But this is the very doctrine Missouri accuses as nonsense and as also false.

Hutter writes in his Exposition of the Book of Concord: "Willingly we admit that neither faith nor the foresight of faith is the cause of our election. Faith is not, because in itself, inasmuch as it is a virtue, habit, or quality it does nothing whatever toward our election or toward our justification; in this respect its condition is altogether the same as that of the works or merits of men. But we also say that the foresight of faith is, properly speaking, not the cause of our election; for it was already shown, in the general remarks above, that foresight, as also foreknowledge, is not the cause of anything foreseen or foreknown, but embraces only the knowledge of all that is foreknown. And yet, admitting this, our cause is not on this account lost" (as far as Huber and the Calvinists are concerned*), "nor has it been proven thereby on the part of our opponents that faith in Christ must be expunged from the decree of election. For it has already been incontrovertibly demonstrated above that the foreknowledge of God, without which the decree of election could not take place, referred solely to Jesus Christ foreseen (1 Peter 1, 20), as the true cause of our election; and to Him not only in so far as He completed the work of redemption, but in so far as He becomes ours through faith. For without faith Christ benefits us nothing."

"After prefacing this, we infer that two things chiefly must be considered in the decree of election: namely the decree itself and the mode of the decree. The decree itself refers to the gra-

* To-day we must add: and as far as the Missourians and Waltherians are concerned.

cious purpose of electing men unto salvation. But the mode of the decree includes the order of means, through which God decided to carry out His decree: that He would have as the elect unto life only those who perseveringly believe in His Son. Thus, therefore, faith necessarily depends on the ordination of means, without which no decree of election was ever formed; the election of persons themselves, however, depends on the grace of God and the merit of Christ, but only as embraced by faith. Consequently, when we state that faith in Christ is included in the decree of election, we do not consider faith in itself, but we designate Christ alone, embraced by firm faith, as the meritorious cause of predestination."

"If now the question is raised, whether election depends on faith, or faith upon election, we respond that both can readily be claimed, but each in a certain respect. For in so far as there is a certain mutual connection between things that belong to an order in so far also faith surely depends on election, and vice versa election depends on faith, or, which is the same, upon Christ apprehended by faith. For none but believers are the elect. And there is here a mutual relation between election and faith like that between the thing ordered and the order, or between the thing determined and the determination, but not like that between the effect and its cause. For election does not depend on faith as an impelling or meritorious cause, but as an instrumental or organic cause, which apprehends the grace of God electing and the merit of Christ offered in the Word of the Gospel."

"And assuredly, our opponents will not be able to eliminate this consideration of faith, of which we have just spoken, from the eternal decree of election, until they bring testimony from the Scriptures that God from eternity decreed to save men through other causes than those through which He saves them in time; or, what amounts to the same thing, that God formed one decree of election and another of execution, and to think this of God would be impious and blasphemous, as it would subject Him to a kind of mutability."

"Meanwhile we honestly declare that we will begin no controversy whatever, should any one prefer to call faith as thus considered in the decree of election an instrumental cause, or a part of the order which is included in the decree of election" (Liber Christ. Conc. Explicatio, p. 1101-1104.)

Hutter writes in his Compend of the Articles of Faith:* "Since Christ is the Redeemer of all men, would not, if predestination took place in Christ, all men be the elect and consequently election universal? Answer: Christ is considered in the decree of election not merely as the universal Mediator, but also in so far as He is actually apprehended by men through faith. See Book of Concord, Fol. 324, 'But Christ . . . . cast out.' (Jacobs' Transl., p. 661, 67 and 68.) Passages: John 1, 18; John 6, 40; John 3, 16; John 6, 37." Question 27: "Is it therefore your opinion that God elected men with regard to foreseen faith? Answer: Why should I not believe this, since the Holy Scriptures confirm this very thing most explicitly? The apostle at least asserts, Eph. 1, 5, that God has chosen us unto the adoption of sons of God. But now Christ has given this power to become God's children not to those who are born of blood, or of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man, but to those who are born of God, i. e. as John interprets it, to those who believe in His name. John 1, 12-13. Hence Christ describes the elect, John 17, 20: Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall

* In 1602 Hutter completed his Commentary on Ph. Melanchthon's Loci, which was afterwards published as his great Loci Theologici. He now began to desire a different Compend from that of Melanchthon as a basis for his lectures. He also received an order from the Wittenberg Faculty at the command of the Elector to write such a compend or handbook, the contents of which should be taken as much as possible from the Book of Concord now adopted in Saxony. We, accordingly, find the following title both in the original Latin edition and in the German translation prepared by Hutter himself (1613): "A Brief Compend of all the Articles of Christian Faith from the Holy Divine Scriptures and the Christian Book of Concord." When the little book was finished it was sent to Dresden and Leipzig to obtain the recommendation of those theologians besides that of the Wittenberg Faculty. It was thus published at Wittenberg in 1610, while many of the old faithful F. C. theologians were still living, but it was also frequently reprinted and used as a compend in Latin schools and taken as a basis for lectures on dogmatics in universities, for which reason men like Sol. Glassius, Cundisius, Friedem. Bechmann, Christ. Chemnitz, and others published dogmatical works on it. Also in St. Louis this Compend was dictated in German by Dr. Walther to the students in 1850-52, from which dictation we quote the above passage. It certainly requires a special kind of ingeniousness to assert coolly under such circumstances, "the Synod" has always held and impressed upon its students in the institutions the same doctrine of predestination; but (alas!) Prof. Schmidt and a few brothers-in-law and malcontents have fallen away from this doctrine of Synod! God will surely judge. All accounts are not yet closed!

believe on me through their word; furthermore the apostle, 2 Thess. 2, 13: God hath from the beginning chosen you — in belief of the truth; 1 Tim. 1, 16, the apostle calls the elect 'them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting'; and James writes, 2, 5: Hath not God chosen the rich in faith? And therefore the F. C. declares in its Epitome that God determined to save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and believe on Him. See F. C., Fol. 250: 'Who in His . . . . believe on Him.'" (J. Tr. 257, 13.)

FREDERICK BALDUIN.

Frederick Balduin* published in 1607 thirteen disquisition on the Saxon Articles of Visitation, the latter 4 of which treat of the 4th article, "Concerning Election"; the first 3 were directed against the Calvinists, and the last against Huber. Balduin begins his discussion with the sentence: "For the better understanding of the doctrine of predestination it is necessary to know its causes. Now there are three chief causes: the first is the impelling cause, namely God's merciful and fatherly will toward the human race; the second is the meritorious cause, namely the all-sufficient ransom of Christ, paid for all mortals; the third is the instrumental cause, namely the call, by which the fatherly will of God and Christ's merit is revealed to all in the same way and offered to be apprehended by faith." Faith, as considered in election, is treated by Balduin in the following manner.

"God desires, according to His antecedent will, that men without exception may come to a knowledge of the truth through the appointed means; but since there are some who grasp these means with both hands through the Holy Spirit's help and who steadfastly govern themselves accordingly, He wills, according to His subsequent will, that these alone shall be the elect. And the rest, who stubbornly despise these means, He rejects altogether according to His subsequent will. These two wills, therefore, (the antecedent and the subsequent) are not two con-

* Born 1575 in Dresden, studied since 1593 at Wittenberg where he was made Magister in 1597 and professor of theology in 1604. In 1601 he was together with Æg. Hunnius at the renowned Colloquium at Regensburg. His most important work is the Exposition of Paul's Letters. He died in 1627.

tradictory or opposing wills, but the one follows the other in a subordinate way, because each is taken in a certain respect: 1) The antecedent will establishes what all must do to be saved; the subsequent refers to how men actually conduct themselves (quomodo homines actu se gerant), whether they obey the antecedent will or not; 2) the antecedent will considers the order of election, its end (salvation), and the means leading thereto, as far only as God's side is concerned; the subsequent will considers the same end and the same means, as far as man's adopting them or his rejecting them is concerned. From this it appears clearly that neither works nor any worthiness, or merit, or excellency of any kind moved God to predestinate, but only His mercy and grace, whose foundation is Christ Himself, who reconciled us to the eternal Father through His all-sufficient ransom; for apart from Christ God is for us a consuming fire. For this reason, when the apostle speaks of the election of God's children unto salvation, he adds the means 'in Christ,' Eph. 1, 4. Nor did God elect us for the sake of foreseen faith or of its worthiness and excellence, but He has elected us in Christ unto the adoption in view of faith (intuitu fidei), as also it pleased God to justify and save us not for the sake of faith, but through faith as a beggar's hand. Hence, that we are elected in view of faith as foreknown from eternity dare not be referred to faith as an excellent work, but must be gratefully ascribed to Christ as the one foreknown. In regard to this will of God, through which we are elected 'in Christ,' we assert without fear that it is not unconditional, but throughout an ordered will and limited by faith; for we willingly lend our ear to Paul as an unimpeachable witness, when he declares: 'God hath blessed us in Christ, according as He hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world.' If then, as the apostle declares, we are chosen 'in Christ,' this proves absolutely that Christ is the cause of election, and that the will of election is not unconditional, but subordinated to Christ. And this just as in the act of justification, which is the execution of election, and which rests on its regular means (ordinariis suis constat mediis). For we are accounted just before God not through an absolute grace, but in Christ as apprehended by faith. Rom. 3, 22. 28. If, therefore, the decree is to agree with the execution, and the execution with the decree, we dare not imagine an unconditional election." (Disp. XI, § 47-52.)

"When the question is asked, whether the number of the elect is fixed, so that it can neither be increased nor diminished, this can be understood in a twofold way, either absolutely, or with a presupposition. If it is understood absolutely (simply and in general), then we declare, the number could be increased and diminished. For if more men would have believed in Christ and persevered in the joy of faith unto the end (as they could have done through the means revealed in the Word), the number of the elect would have been greater. If, on the other hand, some of the elect had turned away from God (as they could easily have done through voluntary wickedness), the number of the elect would have been smaller. If, however, the question is understood with a presupposition, if the number is taken as it now is, then it can neither be increased nor diminished, for all that is can impossibly, in so far as it is thus, be different at the same time. Augustine elucidated this by an example: 'If you consider the number of citizens who are entered in the city record and live in the city, as this number actually stands, then it can neither be increased nor diminished; if, however, you consider the number as it might have been, then it is clear that there might have been more or less, since more might have come, just as well as less might have left.' And God's foreknowledge would not on this account have been at all mistaken; nor would the number of the elect, if it had become greater or less, have become in any way uncertain. For if a greater number of Jews and Gentiles had been gathered into the bosom of the Church through the preaching of the Gospel and had been converted in true faith, then indeed the number of the elect would have become greater. But if this had occurred, it would not have remained hidden from the foreknowledge of God. In respect to God the number of the elect is, therefore, ever completely certain and remains so." (§ 60-62.*)

* Considered in itself or as far as only God's gracious will of election itself is concerned, the number of the elect might have been just as large as the number of the redeemed, for God desired to "save" them all, therefore also to ordain them all unto salvation, as far as His will alone is concerned. But on the presupposition of the divine foreknowledge election, which is governed exactly by this foreknowledge, is confined to certain limits, since the will of man is also taken into consideration, inasmuch as he is responsible for either permitting himself to be saved or refusing to do so. But this very, precious evangelical doctrine the latest number of "Lehre und Wehre" (March, 1884, p. 89) reviles again as something ex-

"How does election cause faith while faith is included in election itself? This occurs in different respects. For faith was included in the decree of election according to the foreknowledge and with respect to the divine intelligence; but it is actually awakened in us in accord with the decree. This solution the apostle himself offers. He declares: 'God hath blessed us in Christ, according as He hath chosen us in Christ.' But He has blessed us in Christ as apprehended by faith, hence He has also elected us in Christ as apprehended by faith. It is therefore also evident from this testimony of the apostle that faith is comprehended in the decree of election. Yet it does not precede election, nor is it a cause of election, unless you do not mean a meritorious, but an instrumental cause, which apprehends the mercy of the eternal Father and the merit of Christ offered in the Gospel. For it is solely the mercy of God and the beneficent favor of His will which has caused Him to form such a decree regarding those who believe, and that He would bring them unto salvation in no other way than through the merit of Christ, and this for the purpose of showing His glorious grace. He has, accordingly, accepted us not for our own worthiness, nor for the sake of the merit of our faith; and yet, since He has chosen us in Christ, and since we are included in Christ through faith and in no other way, He has also ranked faith very highly in us, in this respect, that it was His will that faith should enter into the act of election. This is not inaptly expressed by us, when we say, that God has regarded Christ alone in this decree, not merely, however, as He is offered to us, but also as He is apprehended by faith, without which apprehension Christ and all His merit would benefit us nothing. From this it follows that they who do not appropriate Christ's merit are not included in the decree of election. For these are two different acts, when Christ offers us His merit, and when He bestows it upon us, as is clearly shown in John 3, 16. Here we read: 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.' Behold, here is Christ as He offers Himself to the whole world. Then we

---

ceedingly absurd, because then "God would not elect", and "the mysterious contents of the eternal decree of election" would vanish like vapor. The worst part of it all is not that these theological tight-rope-dancers make themselves ridiculous by their affected little tricks, but that they lie so godlessly: The "fathers" were no synergists as we opponents of Missouri are.

read on: 'that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish.' These words show us Christ bestowing His merit upon us. The first act (the offer) is stated in a general manner; the latter (the act of bestowal) is stated in a limited manner, it pertains only to believers. And Christ enters our election in the same way, not merely as the author and beginner of our salvation by virtue of the righteousness He obtained for us, but also as the finisher of our salvation by virtue of the righteousness imputed to us through faith. Now how does Huber come to make both acts universal and to confound the act of love with the act of election? Or how does he come to introduce, as it were, only a half-righteousness of Christ in the act of election, a righteousness obtained indeed, but not imputed?" (Disp. 13, § 34-40.*)

"The source of our salvation is solely Christ who offers His grace to all alike; in those, however, who accept Him, His grace is a superabundant and rich grace, as the apostle teaches, Rom. 5, 10: 'For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life.' Hence Christ as apprehended

* As far as the interpretation of the apostolic expression "in Christ" is concerned, all the above applies to Missouri to-day, only they do not even permit this election "in Christ as not yet apprehended by faith" to be universal, as Huber did, but conceive of it as particular, after the manner of the German Calvinists. The Lutheran order in the decree of election is this: In Christ — foreseen as apprehended by faith on the part of certain persons — these certain persons are elected, for the sake of Christ who is apprehended, unto the adoption of God and the inheritance of Christ. Thus the F. C. declares, that God in His counsel of election "determined that He would accept unto grace all those who accept Christ in true faith, and would grant them the adoption and inheritance", and, on the other hand, that He determined "to save no one except those who acknowledge Christ." When St. Louis imagines: "O, we could soon have reached an understanding with the fathers, they would soon have favored our rejection of the Intuitu fidei theory, and would have thanked us for our better instruction", this is simply a piece of their usual unsavory boasting. We see how these fathers actually did reach an understanding as regards the arguments advanced to-day by Missouri. The latter introduces no new wares at all, it simply rehashes the stale ideas of Huber and the Calvinists. Does Missouri to-day say anything concerning the "election in Christ" that Huber and the Calvinists have not said years ago, and that our fathers reached an understanding in regard to by refutation and rejection? And the correct interpretation of this "election in Christ" is the cardinal point in the whole controversy. Hither, ye Lutherans! Thither, ye Calvinists!

by faith is the cause of election; rejected by unbelief He is of no benefit to the wicked. Thus not our faith, but Christ is declared to be the cause of election; for faith enters the decree of election not because of the merit of its worthiness, but because of its apprehending Christ. On the other hand, the cause of reprobation is not Christ but the rejection of Christ by unbelief and resistance offered to the order established by God." (§ 73, 174.)

"Huber denies that foreseen faith in any way enters the decree of election, since Paul teaches explicitly (Eph. 1) that God has revealed to us this mystery as a mystery of His will according to the good pleasure which He purposed in Himself.*

From this he draws the conclusion, that nothing coming from without, like foreseen faith and perseverance, enters into the decree of election, but that its origin and completions is in the mere will of God and in the good pleasure which He had in His Son. It is certain that the apostle speaks of the cause moving God to form the decree, for one thing, to reconcile unto Himself all without a difference, and for another, to elect unto eternal life only those who believe. When the question is put in this shape, our (Lutheran) churches also claim that we must go back to God's mercy alone. For that He desires in this way to save those who believe, to what could we ascribe it but to the good pleasure of God? For in us He found nothing that would have been worthy of election. Nor did we with our faith anticipate God when He elected; neither do we assert that faith is the cause and the origin of election, as is imputed to us. And yet since God desired to save us only in Christ, and since election

* In the same sense and for the same reason Missouri now desires to expel faith from the "election in Christ." "It is indeed written" — we read in "L. u. W.", '80, 354 —: " 'According as He hath chosen us through Him', or, according to the original text, 'in Him'; but where is it written: According as He hath chosen us as being in Him? and who dares to foist these little words of his own upon the Holy Spirit?" etc. And on page 230: "If we add to 'in Christ': 'in as far as He is ours by faith, in so far as God foresaw faith in Christ', this addition is nothing but an unfounded gloss, just as little as" — (yea, in very truth: "just as little as"! although the writer undoubtedly meant to say: "just as") — "the exegesis: 'us who are in Christ', which introduces a thought not revealed in the Scriptures. They do violence to the Scriptures and mix the clear utterances of the Holy Spirit with human opinions who seek to deduct and to prove the theory of foreseen faith from the Scriptures." The great pity is that all these instructions arrived too late for the fathers!

was to become ours only as regard is had to Christ (unter Rücksichtnahme auf Christum) therefore God in our election had a certain regard to faith.* And thus faith enters election, not as something coming from without or as something foreign, but as something related and joined to that to which it is related" (tanquam Relatum Correlato junctum Electionem ingreditur. § 77-80).

JOHN WEBER.

John Weber† writes: "There is no doubt that God does all He wills, and no one is able to hinder Him. There is where the knotty problem lies, how and in what mode or order God wills to save or to elect. For this took place either absolute, without any regard to faith in Jesus Christ, or ordinate, in view of the fact that through the grace of the Holy Spirit we would believe perseveringly in time. The former is false, the latter true. For we are not chosen simply and without regard to anything, but in Christ before the foundation of the world, Eph. 1. But, since no one can be in Christ except through faith without which it is impossible to please God, Heb. 11, therefore St. Paul declares, Rom. 8, that God (for whom all the future is present) has chosen those to be children and heirs of everlasting joys of whom He foresaw in eternity that in time they would believe constantly in Christ Jesus through the grace of the Holy Spirit. Wherefore he calls them mellontas pisteuein, future believers, 1 Tim. 1, 16. Now as many of these future believers as God in eternity saw and therefore ordained unto life, so many and no more will come to believe in time, Acts 13, 48. Because if God had seen that more of them would believe, then He would have ordained more of them unto eternal life. Since, however, He saw that these only and no more would believe, therefore He ordained these only unto life, and accordingly so many only have believed. According to this order God would save all men, and no devil, sin, death, or hell shall prevent or resist Him. For this reason neither height, nor depth, nor things present, nor things to come,

---

* RESPECTUM aliquem ad fidem habuit. Emphasized thus by Balduin himself.

† He studied at Giessen, where he published writings against the Calvinists already in 1610. In 1611 he was the court-preacher of the Count at Gleichen.

nor death, nor life, nor any other creature is able to separate those who are chosen in Christ according to this order of God, from the love of God which is (not in a mere decree, but) in Christ Jesus, our Lord, Rom. 8. And the Lord Himself declares that no one shall pluck His sheep (who become His sheep through faith in Him, and remain His sheep as long as they believe, Rom. 11, 21) out of His hand, John 10. From this immovable purpose of God (namely that no one shall perish who believes in Jesus Christ, that He is made unto him wisdom, and redemption, and righteousness, and sanctification) St. John also demonstrates and declares concerning these believers that they overcome the world, the prince of darkness, and all his allies. But whosoever does not secure salvation according to this order of God cannot be written and recorded in the book of the elect. For this is the eternal, well-pleasing will of God, according to which He will bring men to salvation, that they are to believe in Christ and abide in faith and in a good conscience till the end, Matt. 24. He who fails in this will fare as Samuel declared to King Saul, 1 Sam. 13: 'Thou hast done foolishly: thou hast not kept the commandment of the Lord thy God, which He commanded thee: for now would the Lord have established thy kingdom (thy salvation) for ever. But now thy kingdom (thy salvation) shall not continue.' So also St. Paul declares: 'And thou standest by faith. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in His goodness; otherwise thou shalt also be cut off,' Rom. 11." (Guide of the Ancient and Correct Faith, pag. 87-89.)

"This, however, does not establish what Dr. Huber teaches: Since Christ obtained and prepared a ransom for each and every man, therefore all men are chosen unto eternal life in Christ from eternity. No; the dance requires more than a pair of red shoes. It is not sufficient for the decree of predestination that God kill His oxen and prepare everything on His part, the invited guest must also appear by faith in Christ and remain till the end of the feast. On these two requirements God has had His eye from eternity. For those of whom He foresaw that they would appear and continue at this heavenly feast, and none others did He elect in Christ that they should be heirs of God and co-heirs of Christ, Rom. 7, 18. This appears incontrovertibly from the judgment of Christ, passed on His own invited guests, where

He calls those who came in faith the 'chosen,' those who remain away only the called. Besides, if all men are, properly speaking, elected, then the Turks, heathen, and unbelievers would also have to be 'children of God and co-heirs of Christ.' Because God's predestination takes place per modum adoptionis (after the manner of adoption); hence: him whom God elects He receives as His child and heir." (P. 95.)

DAVID RUNGE.

David Runge* writes: "God indeed desires to save all men, but not absolutely, i. e. without the limitation of an order, no matter what they may do, whether they believe in Christ or do not believe, whether they repent or do not repent. This Huberian decree is nowhere revealed in the Scriptures. On the contrary, the Scriptures add the declaration concerning the order according to which God is ready to save us. Ezek. 33: As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that he may turn and live. 1 Tim. 2: God will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. 2 Peter 3: God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. Thus Paul connects our election with 'foreknowledge,' Rom. 8. Likewise Peter, 1 Epistle, 1. And since the Lord knew, in His wisdom from all eternity, as in an act and survey most perfectly present, that all men would not believe and use correctly the order of salvation He proposed, therefore He determined, according to His eternal and infallible foreknowledge, to save those who would believe, and to damn those who would not believe. John 3: He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life. These decrees of the subsequent will of God, the first of which concerns election, and the second reprobation, were formed from eternity in the secret counsel of God, and did not originate in time after the application. Yet He desired

* Born 1554 at Greifswalde, the son of Jacob Runge who had studied under Luther at Wittenberg and did not die till 1597 as professor at Greifswalde. David studied at first in Stettin, then in Tuebingen (under Jacob Andreæ and Jacob Heerbrandt), finally also at Wittenberg under Hunnius, whom he accompanied to Regensburg for the great doctrinal debate with the Jesuits after he had become his colleague as professor of theology. Died 1604.

that all men without exception should believe in the Son and obtain everlasting salvation. Since, however, the greater part would prevent the divine generation of faith in them through their obstinate wickedness and would reject the Word (Acts 13, 46), therefore He has rejected them from eternity (not because of an absolute hatred on His part, or because of His good pleasure, but) because of His just indignation at their final unbelief, according to the clear declaration of Paul, Rom. 11, 20: Because of unbelief they were broken off, i. e. cut away out of the true olive tree. Those, however, who would believe through the operation of the Holy Spirit He had chosen unto salvation from eternity, not for the sake of their foreseen faith as a quality inhering in them, but solely through Christ and for the sake of Christ as apprehended by faith. Eph. 1: God hath chosen us in Christ unto salvation in belief of the truth. And since these persons, compared with the former class, are less in number, it is said: Few are chosen, and: The remnant according to the election of grace will be saved. Not many wise, noble, mighty according to the flesh are called, but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to bring to nought things that are. The cause of this particularity, however, dare not be attributed to God,* as though it was His will, that only a few should believe, and that the rest should perish, but the cause must be attributed to the devil and to men. For if a greater number had believed in Christ, this fact would not have remained hidden from God, who knows all things, and they would, accordingly, have been recorded from eternity in the number of the elect. — We must therefore distinguish closely between the decrees of the antecedent and of the subsequent will. In the former God decrees the restitution of the human race, the mission of His Son and His effective propitiation for all men, the calling of all to use and enjoy this blessing; and He wills, He desires earnestly, He stipulates, He decrees that all men shall believe and obtain salvation. In the subsequent will the order of salvation is con-

* As is done by Missouri and the Calvinists, claiming in regard to the "saparation of persons" that God deals according to His "free grace", His "free election"; that He owes no man anything and therefore deals as He pleases; that He makes use of His "sovereign right" to have mercy on whom He will have mercy, and to harden whom He will harden; that therefore experience also shows, God does not remove in the case of millions of men the very same resistance which He could just as easily remove as in the case of the rest! !

sidered, not as this order is established by God, but as it is used by men. Since God now sees that some would despise it, others use it, He decrees concerning the former that they shall perish as His enemies and despisers; but concerning the latter, of whom He foresees that they would rightly use this order and believe in Christ, He decrees the contrary, that they shall enjoy everlasting salvation. And since God's decrees are immutable, it is impossible that the finally impenitent, in so far as they are and remain such, should be saved, and vice versa that those who believe to the end (who are otherwise termed the elect) should perish. Matt. 24." (Comment. in Gen. p. 763.)

Runge writes again: "The twofold willing of God, that of compassion as well as that of reprobation, dare not be referred to an absolute will of God, depending only upon the mere unconditional good pleasure of God, but upon the ordered will revealed in the Word. For the Lord shows whom He is ready to embrace with His mercy, namely as many as flee to Christ in true faith. But it is His will, that all men without exception may do this, 1 Tim. 2. On the other hand, He teaches that He will punish all who despise His Word with blindness and obduracy, Is. 6. And this will of God does not contradict the former, but is subordinate to it. For the former will, which Damascenus calls the antecedent (lib. 2, cap. 29), considers the means of salvation, as they are placed before all men and directed to the object fixed by God, viz. Christ and His merit and the call through the Word and Sacrament. In this will there is but one decree of one kind, according to which God desires that all may believe and be saved. The other will is called the subsequent will, and considers the same means as they are either used or neglected by men.* This

* We note by the way that this distinction between the antecedent and the subsequent will of God is emphasized and utilized throughout by the F. C. theologians and their immediate pupils. This distinction, however, Missouri rejects in the doctrine of election, since, if it were accepted, not only non-election but also election would have to be understood as having taken place with regard to man's foreseen conduct. It is strange, however, that Missouri finds it necessary to let this distinction between the antecedent and the subsequent will stand in the case of the non-elect. In their case God looks first to their future conduct toward the order of grace, before He decides whether they shall be among the elect or not. The whole thing evidently leads to a double totally different will of grace in the heart of God. For as far as the elect are concerned God left them no choice in regard to their salvation or damnation, but took their election into His own hand from the start and predestinated them unconditionally

gives rise to a twofold decree in the subsequent will, one in regard to those who actually believe and to whom everlasting salvation is promised, John 3. The other in regard to those who are actually unbelieving, and this in so far as they are such and persist in unbelief. To these everlasting damnation is announced, Mark 16: He that believeth not shall be damned. John 3: He that believeth not the Son, the wrath of God abideth on him. These passages explain Paul's sentence and turn our hearts from the consideration of the hidden God to that of the revealed God. Therefore, although our election has its foundation and origin in the universal love of God toward the whole world and in His antecedent will, it is nevertheless brought to its final goal and conclusion only by a decree of the subsequent will. Rom. 8, 29; 1 Peter 1, 2. In this doctrine, therefore, precipitous cliffs must be avoided on either hand, here that of Calvinism, there that of Huberianism. Calvinism invents the doctrine, that certain persons, who must now of necessity be saved, are elected unto eternal life by an unconditional and absolute will,* while all the rest of the human race has been rejected without regard to their unbe-

---

unto the attainment of salvation. To the rest God declares: The election and decision of the final outcome shall lie in your hand, not in mine. Hence: grace with election for the elect, grace without election on God's part for the non-elect. Two different wills of grace! With and without the "guarantee" of salvation!

* The very same thing Missouri teaches, and thus agrees in the very bottom of its doctrine of election with Calvin. For 1) Missouri teaches that not foreseen believers as such were elected unto life, but only "certain persons" who still "lie in the universal depravity" with the rest; 2) it was not Christ's merit apprehended by faith, which conditioned according to God's foresight "the separation of persons" into elect-unto-life and non-elect-unto-life, but only the secret, arbitrary, free purpose, the hidden good pleasure of God; 3) they who are thus elected must be saved, the rest will with certainty not be saved, as surely as God is God. Cf. Report of '77, p. 24. "God has elected a number of men unto salvation already from eternity; He has decreed these shall and must be saved; and as surely as God is God, so surely these will be saved and none besides these." Now if this had been said according to the Scriptures and the Confession of foreseen constant believers as such, the doctrine would be altogether correct and would agree perfectly with the revealed universal counsel of salvation. But Missouri most decidedly rejects the "Intuitu fidei theory" of the revealed God and emphasizes over against it, as the genuine key of the doctrine of election, Calvin's "secret good pleasure" which elected unto salvation without a revealed rule. Only a sophist could appeal to the fact, that the sentence can indeed be understood in the orthodox way.

lief by the mere good pleasure of God.* This notion destroys the universal promises of the Gospel, annuls the merit of Christ obtained for all men, robs the universal call of all efficacy on the part of God and His offer, and ascribes to God, when He laments human misery and our destruction, a hypocritical dissimulation and a contradiction between His words and the real meaning of His heart. Besides, this doctrine fills men's hearts with epicurean security and presumptuousness, as though one could be absolutely certain of the treasure of eternal salvation. Huberianism, on the other hand, imagining that God has elected all men in Christ unto salvation, whether they believe or not, excludes the second part of the divine order, namely faith apprehending the Mediator, from the decree of election, and claims, in contradiction to the voice and declaration of the entire Scriptures, that all men (even those termed in the Scriptures reprobate, dogs, swine, men without God, aliens to the covenants of God) are truly and properly the 'elect' of God and the beloved of God. The middle way between these two extremes (Calvinism and Huberianism) is taken by the doctrine of the Church concerning the ordered election of the subsequent will, maintaining the truth and evangelical universality of the promises of grace, as well as distinguishing the elect from the reprobate by the mark of faith." (Comment. in Ex., p. 320.)

* This, to be sure, Missouri does not say; on the contrary, it claims to oppose Calvin and all Calvinism most decidedly in the doctrine of reprobation. It would like, as it seems, to glue together the Calvinistic doctrine of election, in so far as it excludes regard to future faith, and the Lutheran doctrine of reprobation, which includes and presupposes regard to foreseen unbelief. A curious yea-and-nay-theology! If you inquire in general: Does God look to faith in election unto salvation? — the answer is: "Nevermore! That would be nothing but the Intuitu fidei theory of our fathers who have deviated from the Scriptures and the Symbol, the theory we have so vehemently interdicted and reviled!" But if you ask especially: How does it come that the non-elect were not also elected unto salvation? — then the answer is: "God regarded faith, and since He did not foresee faith, He could not elect these, like the elect, unto salvation (and unto faith)." — As often, however, as Missouri "goes deeper", it appears that it teaches a reprobation unto unbelief just as regardless as its election unto belief. For, we are told, God here, in irreconcilable contradiction to His universal will of grace, makes use of the "sovereign right", to have mercy on whom He will have mercy, and to harden whom He will harden! This surely means: to reject whom He will reject!

GEORGE STAMPEL.

George Stampel* writes. "Election or predestination is the eternal decree or purpose in the heart of God, according to which, in unmerited goodness, and in accord with the good pleasure of His will, for the manifestation of His glorious grace, He chose in Christ, or for the sake of the merit of Christ, a church from among the fallen and justly condemned human race, and predestinated unto eternal life all those of whom He foreknew that they would apprehend Christ in constant faith, by virtue of the assisting grace of the Holy Spirit, through the Word and Sacrament. Or: It is the decree of God to save men through Christ." (Hypotyposis Theol., p. 62.)—"Predestination, however, does not embrace merely the work of salvation in general, but also the persons themselves; yet not all men simply, but only certain ones and a few; yet not as our reason or as the opinion of the Law may estimate them, nor as outward appearance may distinguish them as preferable to others, but those who have been implanted in Christ according to the doctrine of the Gospel through Baptism (Gal. 3, 27; Tit. 3, 5), who hear the voice of the true Shepherd (John 10, 27), who thirst after righteousness (Matt. 5, 6), who embrace it by faith (Rom. 8, 20; Acts 13, 48), who have the testimony of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8, 16), and who by prayer as the seal of election (2 Tim. 2, 19), by sanctification of life whereunto they are called (Eph. 1, 4), by piety and patience make their calling and election sure (2 Peter 1, 5, 10), and persevere to the end (Matt. 10, 22; 24, 13; Rom. 8, 29-30.") (Page 65.)

JOACHIM ZEHNER.

Joachim Zehner† writes in his Compend of Theology, published in 1607: "What is predestination? It is the decree or purpose of God's will, formed from eternity according to His foreknowledge, by which God has ordained unto eternal life all those who would perseveringly believe in Christ. What is God's

* Born 1561 at Soltwedel in the March (of Brandenburg); studied at Helmstaedt, Tuebingen, and Rostock; since 1597 professor in Frankfurt on the Oder; since 1611 Superintendent at Luebeck. Died 1622.

† Born 1566 in Themar; studied at Schleusingen and Wittenberg; was made Lector at Schleusingen and General Superintendent in the Henneberg territory. Died 1612.

antecedent will? It is God's eternal decree declaring that He earnestly and constantly desires all men to be saved through faith in Christ. This will of God is universal and rests on three invincible foundations: 1) The universal love or mercy of God; 2) the universal and sufficient merit of Christ; 3) the universal call of all men. What is God's subsequent will? It is God's eternal decree to save believers and to damn unbelievers. This will becomes a particular will, not through God's fault, but through fault of men, who despise the order of election instituted by God and will not appropriate the grace offered through Christ. . . . What extremes must be avoided in this article? 1) Absolute particularity, i. e. the ravings of the Calvinists, who imagine that by an absolute and unconditional will or decree, without any regard whatever to faith or unbelief, God has chosen some unto life, and rejected the rest so that they could never be saved. 2) Absolute universality or the new dogma of Huber, who endeavors to expel regard to faith from the eternal act of election, and to assert a universal election of all men.

ESAIAS SILBERSCHLAG.

Esaias Silberschlag* delivered at Erfurt in 1604 "Six sermons elucidating correctly and thoroughly, from the Word of God and the consensus of the most important teachers of the church, the article concerning God's eternal predestination and election." We quote only a few of the most striking passages. "We do not say with Puccius that God has predestinated and elected all men without distinction unto salvation. Nor with Calvin, that God has predestinated and ordained only according to His mere counsel and pleasure some few men unto salvation and the greater part of the human race unto damnation. Nor with the Pelagians, that God considered future works, and for the sake of these predestinated some unto life and others unto

* Born 1560 at Erfurt; was made Rector of the school for preachers in this city in 1582; and Doctor of Theology at Marburg in 1585. He died in 1606 at Erfurt as professor of theology and Senior of the Ministerium. He was the son of George Silberschlag, who together with Andrew Poach in 1564 maintained the universality of predestination, in so far as God wants all men to believe in Christ and be saved through Christ. Such a conditional universality of election is also taught by the Scriptures and the Confession.

death. On the contrary (we teach) with the Scriptures and the important ancient teachers of the church that God foresaw and regarded the faith of those who would in the future believe in Jesus Christ, in whom and for the sake of whom we are chosen unto salvation, Eph. 1, and who would remain constant in their faith till the end. Wherefore, on the other hand, He ordained unto damnation those of whom He foresaw that they would cast to the winds the means whereby we come to faith, and that they would despise God's counsel regarding themselves, Luke 7, and thus remain in unbelief, so that they shall be judged because they do not believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God, John 3."

On Rom. 8, 29 (hous proegno) Silberschlag remarks: "Calvin wants to take 'foreknow' in this passage as signifying to receive unto adoption, whereby God has always distinguished His children from the damned. . . . But such glosses will not stand the test here. It would be hard for Calvin to prove that foresight means to receive as one's child. Where are other passages exhibiting such a use of the word? . . . Therefore, it will be best for us to keep in all simplicity the common signification of the word, and to say, that God has foreseen and regarded something when He elected us unto salvation in the beginning, and that He did not absolutely form a mere decree, and elect the one unto salvation, and reject the other unto damnation, simply according to His mere will. Hence Ambrosius says rightly in regard to these words: 'Those are called according to the purpose, of whom God foresaw that they would believe, so that He would know them before they would believe.' "

"What praescire (foreknow) and praegnoscere, (foreknow) mean the children in the schools know. These words mean to foreknow something, to perceive, note, and understand something in advance. This, however, does not refer to the substance or nature of man, otherwise they would all be elected unto eternal life, because God foresaw all, who would come on earth, as long as the world would stand. Hence it must be understood of something else, of something in or about man. But there is nothing in man, belonging to His Christianity, except faith and good works, and since it could not have been works, it must have been faith. This is a fundamental point of our doctrine and confession in this article over against Calvin, who would force a mere decree upon God and admit no prescience here, in spite of the

fact, that the two apostles mentioned state and demand it so clearly."

"The article concerning predestination must be taken and studied from the Gospel. Where this is taught, there will soon be people who conclude: Since the Gospel teaches that Christ died for all, and that God would have all men to be saved, therefore all men must now be elected and predestinated unto salvation. They consider indeed Christ's universal merit, but they forget the application, and do not consider that Christ is of no benefit to us if we do not grasp Him by faith and appropriate His benefits. As St. Paul writes, Gal. 5, concerning those who attempt to become just through the Law of Moses, that Christ profits them nothing, and that they have lost Christ. They too look upon God's favorable will, which He bears antecedenter (antecedently) towards all men who are His creatures, but fail to consider that He nevertheless would save only those who believe in Christ. Consequently, if we desire to be undeceived in this matter, we must look to Christ in His merit in so far as He becomes ours, and to God's will and promises in so far as we govern ourselves according to them and embrace and apprehend them.

"That God did not make a mere decree, but regarded something certain in His work, whereby He chose us unto salvation, is established by passages of Scripture, as quoted above. Rom. 8: Whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate. Rom. 11: God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew. 1 Peter 1: Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father. God knows all things that have taken place and that shall yet take place. He knows all the hairs of our head, Matt, 10, knows and understands all our thoughts afar off, and there is not a word in our tongue that He knows it not altogether. His understanding is unsearchable and infinite, Is. 40; Ps. 147. Did He not then foresee before the creation of man and of the world how each would act in his life and conduct himself? This, therefore, His election took into account, whereby He predestinated whom He foresaw. Hence prescience must of necessity belong to predestination. But since God could not have looked upon works, as was clearly proven above, it must, without contradiction, have been faith to which God by His prescience looked. This is certain 1) because the article of predestination does not belong to the doctrine of the Law which deals with works, but to the Gos-

pel which is a doctrine of faith, as St. Paul teaches, 2 Tim. 1. Therefore this article is called the word of faith, Rom. 10. Therefore God has regarded nothing in us, in our election unto salvation, save only faith which apprehends Christ and is required of us in the Gospel. 2) Rom. 11 teaches that our election unto salvation is only a work of grace. But where there is grace, this does away with the merit of works, and faith alone is required, whereby we apprehend Christ and all His benefits. And we can by no means receive grace, unless we believe in Christ, the sole and living throne of grace, John 3. 3) Because St. Paul writes, Eph. 1, that we are chosen in Jesus Christ. And he testifies furthermore, Eph. 3, that Christ dwells in our hearts through faith. . . . Once more, it can only be faith in Christ that God foresaw when He elected us unto life. This appears 4) in the fact, that the Gospel combines the two articles, that concerning predestination, and that concerning our justification before God, as is shown by 2 Tim. 1 and Rom. 8. From this it must follow that we dare not accept one cause in the article of justification and another in the article of predestination, as Philippus Melanchton teaches in a Christian and good manner in his locis communibus. As we are now justified for the sake of Christ, when we embrace Him by faith, so we have been chosen from the beginning of the world unto eternal life for the sake of Christ, whom we would embrace in the future by faith. 5) When the apostle, Tit. 1, calls saving faith the faith of the elect, he desires to teach that God did not look to works, but especially to faith, and that He chose the elect for Christ's sake in whom they believe. . . . 6) We prove our doctrine and confession also from the testimony of the apostle, when he declares, Heb. 11: Without faith it is impossible to please God. When God chose us unto salvation, He chose us according to the good pleasure of His will, Eph. 1. . . . But if God chose us because He loved us in His Son Christ Jesus, since in Him alone we are acceptable to God, Eph. 1, and if we did not yet exist as then and consequently could have had no faith, it must follow that God looked upon future faith, and thus chose unto life us who would in the future believe in Christ. 7) When God elected us, He inscribed us in the Book of Life which is Christ (Phil. 4; Rev. 3). But Christ can benefit no one who does not believe in Him. Therefore God inscribed no one in the Book of Life except those only of whom He saw that they would believe in Christ. Finally, 8) it is indeed certain that God would

have all men to be saved prima voluntate (according to His first or antecedent will), if only they would all believe. But since the greater part will not believe and only the smallest number believes, God wills voluntate secunda (according to His second or subsequent will) that most of them be damned, and that the smallest number, namely those alone who believe, be saved. And the unbelieving are already condemned, because they do not believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God. John 3. But did not God foreknow which would remain in their damnable unbelief? Yea, He did indeed foreknow without a doubt. . . . Therefore, He elected only those of whom He knew that they would believe in Christ and remain steadfast in faith unto their end."

WOLFGANG FRANZ.

Wolfgang Franz* writes: "The Scriptures say in a human way of God that He has a book and that He enters on it the faith or the unbelief of every man regarding the revealed Word and means of salvation, as also other acts. Ps. 139, 16: 'In Thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.' Dan. 7, 10: 'The judgment was set, and the books were opened.' This is not said to signify that God really keeps such books, but because He knows all believers by virtue of His perfect foreknowledge, foresees and loves and predestinates them unto eternal honor according to the faith they show His Word, something like men record those whom they owe returns for faithfulness shown, that they may not forget. Those, therefore, of whom God foresaw that they would believe and obey Him according to His will, whom for this reason He determined to glorify eternally, are said to be recorded in heaven or inscribed in the Book of Life." (Tract. de Interpret. S. S., p. 407.)

"They are called the elect (Matt. 20 and 22) who accept the call and hold steadfastly to it and do not leap back, and of whom

---

* Born 1564 at Plauen; studied at Frankfort on the Oder under Christ. Corner, one of the six authors of the F. C., and at Wittenberg. He died as professor of theology at Wittenberg in 1628. — The aged Corner did not die till 1594, and was therefore not in ignorance concerning the interpretation of the F. C. maintained by Hunnius and Leyser in opposition to Huber.

God from the beginning foresaw that they would be such, and whom He predestinated as such foreseen persons unto everlasting salvation." (Ibid., p. 407.)

BALTHASAR MENTZER.

Balthasar Mentzer, the elder,* wrote in German and in Latin one work after another against the Hessian and other German Calvinists, Stein, Crocius, Eglinus, Martinius, and others. The Reformed of Hessia and of Bremen had given the Lutherans their choice between Christ and faith, like Missouri, so that the final decree to save only certain persons was to rest on Christ indeed and His merit, but without regard to faith which apprehends Christ's merit. Faith and the appropriation of Christ's merit was to flow from election as a means for the end; so that the order would be: 1) Christ and His merit; 2) the decree to save certain persons only through Christ (election unto salvation); 3) the decree, following from and based on this, to bring these same persons most certainly and infallibly unto faith and to preserve them therein (election unto steadfast faith). We, of course, can bring only a few of the main passages, which show clearly how foreign to the most prominent theologians who had grown up in the F. C. Church was the thought, that God had not elected believers as such, but simply sinners from among sinners, wicked from among the wicked, godless persons from among the godless, enemies from among enemies, unconverted people from among the unconverted, men without faith from among men without faith; and that He elected and firmly predestinated these

* Born 1565; studied at Marburg; was there made Magister and Lector in 1584; pastor at Kirtorf in 1589; on John Winckelmann's earnest admonition professor of theology at Marburg in 1595. Died 1627. After the writings of men like Hunnius, Leyser, Gerlach, Arcularius, and others, who as subscribers to the F. C. have authentically explained the sense of the 11th article, we must consider the writings of men like Runge, Balduin, Mentzer as corroborating witnesses. For many of the first subscribers were still living, who by their general silence without exception testify that the doctrine, defended most unanimously and zealously by all Lutheran theologians at that time, that election unto salvation pertains to foreseen believers as such, is the true doctrine of the F. C. and of the Lutheran Church, and that the contrary Calvinistic and Missourian doctrine, rejected by the Confession, on the other hand, is the "mere" review which elects "certain persons" regardlessly unto salvation and unto all means.

as such sinners, wicked, godless persons, enemies, unconverted people, and men without faith, 1) unto salvation itself, unto the certain attainment of everlasting salvation, and therefore 2) unto infallible conversion and perseverence; and all this without in any way regarding any of their conduct toward His means of grace or His order of grace.

Mentzer writes: "The Calvinist claims as we do with Paul that we are elected according to the eternal purpose, counsel, and good pleasure of God, but he deviates from Paul and from us in inventing the fatalistic and unconditional decree: Some certain persons, in particular this, that, and the other shall be the elect, by far the greater number, however, namely this, that, and the other, and these and those and the others shall be the reprobate. Why? Because it seemed good to Him, it so pleased the divine will. Here is deep silence as concerns the order of the means of salvation. And the Calvinist himself calls this a secret decree, from which I conclude firmly that this decree or good pleasure is not one and the same with that concerning which Paul so often testifies that it is revealed to us in the Gospel." (Opp. 2, 768.)

"Since in this (Calvinistic) decree only men themselves are regarded absolutely and unconditionally — this, that, the other, these, those — without any regard to the means of salvation, whether they believe or not, — therefore this doctrine must appear suspicious to all godly people, for it is not only not found in the Gospel, but is also entirely separated from the Gospel and from faith. Neither will this sophistry help the matter, when they claim that the Gospel and faith are indeed taken into consideration, since without them we could not be saved. For this is meant (of the Gospel and of faith) only subsequently and not antecedently, i. e. the Gospel and faith do not enter the circle of election itself, in which God electing and man elected stand; in this circle there are no means, for these are added afterwards." (Opp. 963.)

"Crocius denies that foreseen faith in Christ has its place in election. From this it follows that election is absolute and depends on the mere and unconditional will of God, because it so pleased Him. For as the good pleasure of God is constituted, according to which we are elected, so also is election itself constituted. But this good pleasure of God, according to which we are elected, is absolute and unconditional in the eyes of all Cal-

vinists: because it so pleased Him. In the eyes of Lutherans, on the other hand, it is ordered: He who shall believe and shall be baptized, shall be saved. Therefore, in the eyes of Calvinists election is unconditional: This one, that, the other shall be elected, because it so pleased God. In the eyes of Lutherans, however, election is ordered in Christ: This one, that, the other shall be elected, because he believes and is baptized, namely according to the eternal foreknowledge of God the Father." (Opp. 1, 535.)

"Which did God elect? Crosius is silent on this point. Those of Dort say: 'certain men' or 'certain persons' without any further description. We also say that certain men or persons have been elected, but we add: who believe in Christ." (Opp. 1, 755.)

"Stein (the Cassel Calvinist) concludes: 'God has found no cause in us for the sake of which He might have selected or chosen us in preference to others unto eternal life, the cause of such election is solely and alone God's gracious will; hence this will of God can be termed absolute.' — I answer: That no cause was found in us, for the sake of which we might have been elected, is true, for although in the beginning we were created in Adam for eternal life, the deplorable fall resulted, which caused that we should die the eternal death on account of our sin, according to the serious threat of God, Gen. 2, 17: In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. Consequently, if God had dealt with us according to His strict justice, we would all have been damned on account of our sins. But God looked upon our misery with His mercy and formed a gracious decree, how we might be saved, concerning which Christ testifies, John 3, 16: 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' God's righteousness and truth stood against us who had offended the divine Majesty by sin. His grace and mercy, however, had pity on us poor creatures in our misery and desired to help us. Here now the unsearchable grace, wisdom, and mercy of God shine forth in the divine decree, will, and good pleasure, that the blessed Son of God is to be given to us poor miserable men, and that He Himself is to become man and pay for our sins, satisfy the righteousness of God and purchase salvation for us; and even more, that all His benefits obtained for us are to be proclaimed, offered, and presented to

us by the Gospel; and that the Holy Spirit is to work efficaciously in us through the preaching of the Gospel and the distribution of the Sacraments, enkindle, strengthen and preserve faith in us, that we may apprehend and possess Christ and in Him God's grace, forgiveness of sins, righteousness and salvation; and that then we show and testify by new obedience our gratitude toward God in all manner of good works of love toward God and toward our neighbor; and that in all tribulations also He would grant us consolation and help, protect us against our enemies, and finally lead us from this vale of tears into heavenly joy and salvation. This entire order of the means of our salvation is included in the purpose, decree, will, and good pleasure of God, according to which we are elected unto everlasting salvation. And therefore this purpose is the rule and norm according to which the entire doctrine of eternal predestination must govern itself."* (Examination, etc., p. 171.)

"In Christ He has chosen and ordained unto eternal life — namely (1) in so far as Christ was appointed by eternal love from eternity as our Mediator and Redeemer, and (2) was sent in the fulness of time, and (3) has been firmly apprehended by true faith, which is enkindled by hearing the Gospel through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, Heb. 13, 8." (Opp. 2, 931.)

"'Chosen in Christ' can be predicated of no one who does not belong to Him, who does not as a member of His body acknowledge Him as his head, who is not implanted in Him or stands in a certain relation to Him or dependence upon Him. When now we turn to the Scriptures for advice, they direct us to faith through which we are united with Christ and implanted in Him, and through which He dwells in our hearts. John 1, 12; Gal. 3, 26; Eph. 3, 17; Phil. 3, 13. 14. Hence, as Christ was foreknown before the foundation of the world as the Medi-

* According to Mentzer and all the F. C. theologians the revealed counsel of God unto the salvation of all men and the counsel of predestination are only one and the same counsel, since there is only one "counsel of God" for the saving of men; accordingly predestination considered as a counsel is identical with the universal counsel of salvation, but considered as an act or decree respecting the bestowal of salvation upon certain persons according to the rule and norm of the universal counsel. Missouri finds that this is a fundamental error, since predestination is "an altogether different thing"; a second entirely different "counsel of God" for the bestowal of salvation upon the few elect — this is the "counsel of predestination."

ator and Redeemer of the human race, 1 Peter 1, 18-20, so also those who were foreknown from eternity as being attached by faith to Christ, their Head, were chosen in Christ as their Mediator and Redeemer unto eternal life." (P. 933.)

"The expression: 'God hath chosen us in Christ,' includes 1) Christ Himself as the Mediator, in whom the grace of God who elects so to say resides; 2) the Gospel as the message concerning Christ and the grace of God in Him; 3) faith as the spiritual hand, which embraces and appropriates the Redeemer Christ shown, offered, and bestowed in the Gospel, and in Him also the grace of God who elects. For this reason election unto eternal life can not be described in full or considered in a godly manner without the grace of God, or without Christ, or without faith. According to the analogy of faith, therefore, an analysis and explanation must be made as follows: 1) when it is said that we are elected through the grace of God, we must understand the grace of God in Christ, embraced by faith; 2) when it is said that we are elected in Christ, the Mediator and Redeemer Christ must be understood, in whom the grace of God has been, as it were, deposited, and who is embraced by true faith; and 3) when it is said that we are elected 'in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth,' we must understand the faith enkindled by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel, in so far as this faith embraces Christ in the evangelical promise and in Christ the grace of God who elects unto eternal life. And this in altogether the same manner as in justification, because of the most perfect similiarity between the eternal divine purpose and the execution of this purpose in time. We are justified through the grace of God, not through an absolute grace, but through the grace in Christ embraced by faith. We are justified in Christ as the Mediator and Redeemer, through grace embraced by faith in Him. We are justified through faith enkindled in us by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel, which faith embraces and appropriates the Redeemer Christ and in Him the grace of God who justifies us." (P. 934.)

"Since the whole human race fell in Adam and was driven from Paradise, sin made no distinction among men, but as all were sinners alike so all alike were doomed to condemnation. And yet some from among these sinners are elected unto life, others are rejected that they shall not obtain eternal life, but shall be condemned. Whence this difference? From the decla-

ration of Crocius" (that the decree and its execution must harmonize) "the answer must of necessity follow, this difference is due to faith and unbelief. Those are elected who would believe in Christ through the Gospel; those are rejected who would not believe. Nor can any other difference be pointed out, since, as has been said, all are sinners and therefore worthy of condemnation. And there was no other means for escaping from this condemnation except Christ who must be embraced by true faith in the Gospel. Hence it is said that we are elected in Christ and through Christ, Eph. 1, 4. 5. And therefore these two propositions correspond to each other: Man is justified only through faith in Christ, hence he is also elected only through faith in Christ. And: He is rejected only through unbelief, whereby Christ was rejected." (P. 947.)

"When God elects some few men from among the whole human race, it must be explained how this agrees with His righteousness and truth.* Crocius replies, this is mediated by the satisfaction which Christ rendered. But this satisfaction is universal. And Crocius himself admits that the proposition is untenable: All those for whom Christ rendered satisfaction are the elect. This then is a mere subterfuge, and the whole Crocian argumentation ends in a defense of Calvin's old doctrine, merely using a milder phraseology.† The sum of it is this: God has from eternity chosen unto eternal life some certain men, whom He has loved from eternity in a special manner. Why? Because it so pleased Him. For these therefore He ordained the Savior Christ, these He calls in an effectual manner, grants them faith and saves them. What becomes of the rest? Did He not love them at all? He did not love them 'in a special manner,' so that He wanted to save them; yet He loved them in a general way, and Christ died also for them, but He did not obtain for them as for the elect the grace of conversion in an effectual man-

* Well, well, Mentzer! "It must be explained" ? ! Can you "rationalize" like this, as Missouri terms it? What an exceeding pity that the St. Louis reformers are 300 years too late with their broom for heretics, that they might have "swept out of the Lutheran Church this synergism, Pelagianism, and rationalism!" Alas, that they should have arrived post festum!

† Now please step aside, gentlemen, from Missouri, otherwise some of the blows Mentzer deals out to Crocius might fall upon your heads, since you too attempt to reform our Lutheran doctrine away from Wittenberg in the direction of Geneva — merely using a milder phraseology!

ner, nor in this same manner saving faith and eternal life. And He indeed calls them by the Gospel in a general way, but not in an effectual manner so that they will believe in Christ and be saved, but merely so that they will be without excuse and suffer greater punishment." (P. 967.*)

"Since the Scriptures affirm explicitly in so many passages that Christ died for the whole world, for all men, even for the wicked and for those who perish, Stein has learned a special trick for deceiving the simple and imposing on them by the use of good words. He declares that both is true: Christ has died in general for all men, but in a special way only for the elect. This he adorns by declaring that the Scriptures state, Christ has died for all, and yet they say He has given His life for the redemption of many, that is, according to his interpretation, only for the elect; and this, he tells us, must be understood of the efficacious application and appropriation, that Christ bestows His suffering efficaciously upon the elect and for this purpose enkindles faith in them.† But if this were true, it would follow that Christ

* This sketch of the doctrine of Crocius and other German Reformed by Mentzer, shows that then already the doctrine of two dissimilar wills of grace in God was not unknown to our Lutheran theologians. They rejected and contended against this inequality in the eternal will of love and counsel of grace on God's part as taught by their Reformed opponents in Germany. Missouri to-day dishes up this same fundamental idea concerning a secret inequality in the gracious will of God, declaring it to be the real quintessence of the pure doctrine of the Scriptures and the Confession on "election." "On the one hand," we are told, God would have all men to be saved; but — "on the other hand", as the "hidden God", He upholds "His right to have mercy on whom He will have mercy" — and this among equals, who still lie in the universal depravity, without there being any difference on the part of men to bring about this limitation of the gracious will of God, without God's dealing at all according to His revealed order of grace in actually bestowing His mercy. This is simply teaching that there are two wills of grace in God. The one indeed is universal, making the final outcome, however, (conversion and the reception of salvation) depend on man's conduct. The other, on the other hand, has no regard whatever to man's conduct, but is at once a fixed decree of the will of grace (hence "guaranteeing" conversion, perseverence, salvation), and yet in its nature from the very start a particular will, pertaining only to a few!

† It appears that the Calvinist Stein sought to adorn the duplicity of the will of salvation which he taught by passages of Scripture, and this very much as Missouri does to-day in its teachings in regard to the universal and the particular will of mercy, the latter of which coincides with the gracious will of election.

indeed died for all, but that He did not obtain equal benefits for all, earning faith and salvation only for the elect and not for the rest. And this would amount in the end to the declaration, that Christ indeed died for all, but not in the sense that all should believe and be saved, this being reserved only for the elect. And it would follow furthermore that, when Christ is proclaimed to us in the Gospel and offered to us with all His benefits, the elect must receive something special which is presented and offered to them alone and not to the rest; and this in itself is absurd and contrary to the Gospel. For the very grace of God and the very merit of Christ, and the very righteousness and salvation which believers embrace and appropriate in the Gospel is rejected and cast away by unbelievers, according to the well-known passage, Acts 13, 46."* (Preface to the Examen.)

"As God does not receive us as His children except through faith in Christ, who has reconciled us poor sinners to God, so also God did not elect us unto eternal life except through faith in Christ, who has redeemed us from death and purchased for us life. For God does not ordain a sinful man unto eternal life, on the contrary He condemns him in His first judgment. Therefore, that a sinner may be elected unto eternal life, satisfaction must be rendered for his sin, and that this satisfaction may benefit the sinner, it must be applied to him, and this can be done only through faith. Hence a sinner is indeed chosen unto life, yet not prior to the satisfaction (I speak of the order in the divine foreknowledge, and of the eternal counsel of grace), but through the mediation of this satisfaction, and inasmuch as this satisfac-

* Mentzer here figures out for Stein what all would "follow from" his double definition of redemption, and how "absurd and contrary to the Gospel" this would be. Missouri, of course, objects to such conclusions being drawn from its doctrine, yet the very same things would follow from the Missourian doctrine concerning a double or twofold will of divine mercy. And when it comes to the point, Missouri would logically be compelled to teach in the same way that already in Christ's merit there is something particular, "something special" as Mentzer calls it, for the elect. For this that only the elect, while still lying like the rest as sinners without faith "in the general depravity", have salvation "guaranteed" to them and assured and promised to them by predestination, in preference to all the rest, without regard to their unbelieving condition, this has surely been obtained and earned for them by Christ. This "guarantee" blessing flows for them from Christ's merit, does it not? But it is impossible that this "guarantee" of salvation should have been obtained for all. That must be "something special" in Christ's merit for the elect.

tion was applied to the sinner through faith. For when the satisfaction of Christ is not appropriated by the sinner, God condemns the sinner in His just judgment, beholding and judging in him his sin." (Opp. 1, 1019.) "Therefore, as is the reception unto adoption so also is the election. But now the adoption takes place through faith and in no other way. Therefore the same is true of election.*"

"He who declares that God accepts a sinner without the intervention of Christ's satisfaction flatters the Socinians and attacks the righteousness and truthfulness of God. He, however, who declares that men are elected through the satisfaction of Christ and for the sake of this satisfaction, without at the same time mentioning its appropriation, introduces a universal election, just as the satisfaction is universal, having been rendered for all men and for every single man in the whole world." (Opp. 1, 1019.†)

"Crocius agrees with us that God has elected us in the Redeemer Christ. God therefore looks upon sinful man in election, not as he still lies worthy of condemnation in his sins, but as he is redeemed from his sins through Christ and implanted in Christ as a member of His body; and this appropriation cannot take place except through faith. But Crocius denies that the appropriation through faith has its place in the act of election. Yet we cannot be in Christ without faith, and Christ is of no benefit

* Missouri, however, deals in sophistry on this point, clearly contradicting the Scriptures, John 1, 12; Gal. 3, 27; etc. It argues: We are elected "unto the adoption", which is imparted through faith to certain definite persons; consequently these persons were elected "unto faith." If Missouri were honest, it would conclude furthermore: We are elected unto salvation, which is obtained only by certain persons through Christ and His redemption; consequently these persons alone are elected "unto Christ and unto His redemption." He who is elected unto all the means of salvation must be elected above all unto the redemption through Christ, if he is elected 1) unto salvation, and then 2) unto the means of salvation.

† Missouri, as we know, declares: The causes of election are only these two: God's mercy and Christ's merit. Both of these causes, however, are in themselves universal, and yet election pertains only to certain persons. How does this come? If the two exclusive causes are in themselves universal, then their result and effect should likewise be universal, unless either the consideration of the appropriation by faith or a secret "mere good pleasure" has caused a limitation. Here now Missouri wavers and quavers most pitifully. Now it tells us that God did seek and inquire after faith in the case of the non-elect, and again it declares that God has dealt according to His sovereign right and will (libitum).

to us, if He is not apprehended by faith. Therefore, if the appropriation by faith falls away, there can be no reason, why some are chosen in Christ, the Redeemer of the whole world, and others are not chosen.* For sinners as sinners are not in Christ, but are separated from Him. But in so far as a sinner truly believes he is in Christ as a member of His body. And this is what I have often said: Crocius cannot explain thoroughly what it means to be elected in Christ." (3, 1021.)

"Election is either absolute or qualified and limited by faith in Christ. If you reply, it is limited 'in Christ,' this is no limitation unless faith is added, which divides the whole human race into two classes: believers and non-believers, elect and non-elect. Put aside faith, and there will be no separation of persons in Christ, for Christ has rendered satisfaction for all and for every single man, and yet they are not all the elect, but only those who believe." (1, 1023.)

"It dare not be denied that God selected some from among the lost multitude of the human race redeemed by Christ. Which did He select? Crocius says: 'Those beloved in pure mercy in Christ.' But just before this he declared that this decree is based on the universal kindness and love of God, John 3, 16. From this, however, no cause of particularity can be proven, because God loved all, gave His Son for all, and Christ redeemed all. Here then there is no trace of a separation or selection, for all men without exception, who are created and fallen, are also redeemed. And Christ rendered satisfaction for all in the same way, not more for some, and less for others; He obtained for all alike forgiveness of sins, righteousness, and eternal life. As it was in paradise where the proclamation of the Gospel went out

* Note well: Salvation is obtained perfectly for all sinners in Christ. In the "election unto salvation" God determines who among these sinners (for all of whom Christ obtained salvation perfectly and in the same way) are now actually to receive this salvation; and this means: who alone is to have it, i. e. who is to have it and who is not to have it, for election signifies that only a certain part is taken from the whole multitude. Why are so many excluded from the salvation which is obtained for them? Either because of their unbelief, and then God had regard to faith and inquired after it at least in the case of these; or God paid no attention to faith in the case of any one, when He elected unto salvation, also not in the case of the non-elect, and then these were excluded from the "election unto faith" and from the salvation obtained for them by the use God made of His "sovereign right."

to the whole human race. It detracts from the honor of God and Christ to assert that God does not want to bestow faith upon the greater part of men who have been redeemed through Christ, but only upon some, those who are absolutely the elect.* This absolute love toward some is in no way consistent with the universal redemption which took place according to God's will. Did Christ then obtain the gift of faith for all or only for some? If for all, then the particularity of this decree, according to which faith is to be given only to a few, falls to pieces. But if Christ has obtained the gift of faith only for some, then a difference and an inequality would have to be admitted in Christ's merit itself, that is that He has obtained more for some and less for others. And if this is asserted, then the same inequality would have to exist also in the counsel and good pleasure of God, since Christ's work corresponds to the will of the Father." (1, 1031.†)

"Between Christ and ourselves there must be a connecting link and an application, and this cannot be without faith. There is indeed a fellowship of nature between ourselves and Christ, wherefore Christ is the Redeemer of men, not of angels, Heb. 2, 16. But from this we can conclude neither the election nor the salvation of all men, because a special application is required besides this, namely that I may be able to say with the apostle: I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me. Thus election took place in Christ, through Christ, and for the sake of Christ, that is that all who believe in Him

* This, to be sure, Missouri does not say, declaring rather that God "on the one side" would give faith to all men, if they would not wilfully resist. But where now at bottom, or if we "go deeper", is the cause that only a few are really and actually delivered from their wilful resistance? Here Missouri fetches up the "other side" of God's will of mercy, according to which He "reserves for Himself the sovereign right to have mercy on whom He will have mercy, and to harden whom He will harden" — not according to the different conduct of the called, but with their conduct identical, hence according to a secret unequal will and conduct of God — on the one hand a will of mercy, on the other a will of hardening.

† In quite the same way this applies to Missouri. Missouri admits that Christ "made election possible." Whose election did Christ make possible? That of all, or that only of some? For whom is the possibility of election in Christ's merit? For all, or only for some? If for all and in the same way, then election is conditional and ordered for all. If only for some and in an unequal way, then Christ has obtained the blessing which decides everything, only for some! !

shall have eternal life. Hence he who does not believe is not in Christ, and he who is not in Christ is not elected." (1, 1033.)

"He who says that we are elected in Christ, and yet denies that we are elected through faith, is guilty of asserting contradictory things, just as though he were to say we are indeed justified in Christ, but not through faith." (1, 1033.)

PETER PISCATOR.

Peter Piscator* writes: "It is evident that the word election always signifies a selection or separation. . . . But we do not here understand an absolute and fatalistic or stoic, that is Calvinistic and satanic separation, which opens the uttermost pit of despair for terrified consciences, but we understand that separation by which God selected and separated, in respect to the order He instituted from eternity, believers from non-believers, the penitent from the impenitent, and thus the elect from the reprobate, and by which He determined to save the former through faith in Christ, and to damn the latter on account of their unbelief and their persistent impenitence." (Page 525 of the Commentarius in C. F.)

"The 'purpose,' taken especially, is the unmerited purpose of God to save all men who believe in Christ. . . . There are such promises as are indeed universal, yet by what they presuppose limit themselves to believers. For instance John 5, 24: Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life. On these words Dr. Jacob Andreæ, as quoted by Andrew Osiander, writes: 'To all who hear the Word and believe salvation is promised. And the particularity of election does not conflict with this universality of the Gospel promises. For God did not promise salvation to all promiscuously, but only to believers. Hence the particular election is included in the universal promise, so that no one may imagine the promise of the Gospel does not apply to him because

* Born at Hanau, 1571; studied at Schleusingen, Wittenberg, and Jena; he was made professor and Doctor of Theology in Jena in 1605. Died 1611. His "Commentary on the F. C." was published in 1610, and was the most extensive work on the Confession next to Hutter's "Exposition." Many of the original subscribers were still among the living (for instance Schluesselburg, Weiniger), and they would assuredly have protested, if a foreign heretical sense had been imputed to the Confession.

of his sins or because of an absolute decree fixing his inevitable damnation." (Page 559, 561.)

"Huber, together with the Calvinists, invents an absolute election. For they both place the selection altogether in God's antecedent will, that is in His absolute will, without any regard to or consideration of faith as apprehending Christ and His merit. But in a twofold way they again separate: 1) The Calvinists invent an absolute election of only a few, Huber an absolute election of all; 2) the Calvinists expel Christ and His merit entirely from the act of election . . . Huber, however, includes Christ and His merit in election, but again only in an absolute way." (Page 592.*)

"We must distinguish between the absolute and the conditional or limited will of God. What God wills absolutely takes place absolutely and necessarily; not, however, what He wills with a certain condition and in a certain order, which is not followed by all, wherefore also all are not saved. For it is God' will that all men may be saved, not absolutely, but conditionally, that is if they follow the order prescribed by God and thus come to a knowledge of the truth." (Page 601.)

"In the subsequent will, which follows the antecedent not in point of time, but in point of order, and is relatively subordinates to it, there are two corresponding decrees. The first relates to believers, the second to non-believers. The former is the decree of election, the latter that of reprobation. The former is unto life and unto salvation, the latter unto death and unto damnation. The former is a decree of grace and mercy, the latter of wrath and judgment. The former is constituted like an unearned premium, the latter like a merited punishment. The former has regard to the order as carried out, the latter to this order as neglected, and to the counsel of God unto the salvation of all as this is rejected, despised, and scorned. Luke 7, 30; Acts 7; 15; 13, 46. The first decree declares: As I (God) live, I will and decree that every one who perseveringly believes in Christ shall not perish, but have everlasting life. The second declares: As I live, I will and decree that whosoever does not believe in

* Missouri here pursues the golden mean (!) betwixt Huber and the Calvinists and teaches an election of some for Christ's sake, but not in so far as He is embraced by faith; for this it declares is false doctrine, although it was the faith, doctrine, and confession of the original Church of the F. C.

Christ, but contemns, neglects, despises Him, and persists in unbelief unto the end shall be damned." (Page 601.)

"Although Huber does not wish to appear as removing Christ from the affair of election, he nevertheless takes in reality only the mercy of God (exclusive of Christ) and the universal love of God as the sole cause of election, and this as the absolute cause, inasmuch as when faith, without which Christ benefits no one, is excluded, Christ Himself is removed." (P. 617.)

"Since there is a double and diveded decree, a decree of election, and a decree of reprobation, there is also according to the Scriptures a certain reason for this division . . . namely on the one side faith, on the other unbelief." (P. 621.)

"The question is raised, did God elect believers or such as would believe. We answer that both can be understood in an orthodox sense. For since God sees all things in one indivisible act, He predestinates and elects believers more properly than such as will believe. But if we regard the act of believing and men themselves, who by the use of the means and through the operation of the Holy Spirit obtain faith in time, then it is said rightly that God has elected and predestinated such as will believe (credituros), inasmuch as the Scriptures themselves employ this form of speech. John 17, 20; 1 Tim. 1, 16 (mellontas pisteuein)." (P. 631.)

"From the Scriptures we formulate the following definition: Predestination or election is that especial act of God, by which, before the foundation of the world, from pure grace and mercy in Christ and through Christ, in harmony with His purpose and His foreknowledge, He ordained unto eternal life and decreed to save, for the praise of His glorious grace, those men, who by the power of the Holy Spirit, through the preaching of the Gospel and the use of the Sacraments, would believe perseveringly. Eph. 1, 6. 12." (P. 643.)

JOHN SCHROEDER.

John Schroeder* writes: "Question: Are the promises of the Gospel universal, that is do they belong to all men? — Lu-

* Born 1572 in Hessia; was made Magister at Marburg in 1592 and went with Hunnius to Wittenberg. Since 1599 pastor at Lauterbach in Hessia; 1604 Superintendent at Schweinfurt; 1611 pastor primarius at Nuernberg, where he died in 1621. He wrote much of a polemical character especially against the Calvinists.

theran answer: Yes. For they are offered to all men, believers and unbelievers, penitent and impenitent. But only the penitent and believing enjoy them, because they alone appropriate them by true faith. The unbelieving and wicked lose them through their own guilt, because they cast them away by unbelief and impenitence." (A brief and clear account of the chief disputed articles of the Christian religion between Lutherans and Calvinists. 1612. P. 118.)

"The passage John 3, 16, where He declares: God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life, also serves to elucidate our answer. For, in the first place, we have here a promise and consolation derived from the grace and love of God and from the redemption of His Son, which both extend over the whole human race; for He declares: God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son. Thereupon He promises eternal life not to some, but to all, whom He so loved that He gave His only begotten Son for them, but with the condition, that only whosoever believes in the Son shall have eternal life. And He offers this promise together with its condition to the whole world, and thereby extends His gracious will unto everybody, as having sent His Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved, yet in this manner, that it believe in the Son. Those now, who, according to the condition with which the promise was issued, will believe, upon them He promises to bestow eternal life without fail. Those, however, who will not recognize the good will of God, but despise the counsel of God regarding themselves, He threatens according to His subsequent just will with judgment and eternal damnation, declaring, John 3, 18: He that believeth on Him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already." (P. 121.*)

"God has determined in His counsel according to His foresight (1 Peter 1, 2) to save the smallest number; but He did not so determine because He did not desire otherwise than that those

* The section from which the above passage is taken treats of the "Predestination or Election of God." It is clear that Schroeder makes the selection of persons, to whom God has promised to grant eternal life infallibly ("without fail"), dependent upon foreseen faith. And he states this, not as his private opinion, but as the well-known unanimous doctrine of the Lutheran Church.

only who were embraced in this number should be saved.* So those also whom God in time condemns He determined to condemn. But not in a counsel like that contained in the Calvinistic absolutum decretum, as though He never desired that they too should be saved, or as though He had determined from the very start to condemn the greater number of men, and then, since no one can be condemned without sin, had created them to the end that they should sin, not believe, and be damned in their unbelief. On the contrary, after first determining to offer them His grace through Christ and the Gospel, and then seeing by virtue of His foresight how the greater part would not recognize His gracious will, He resolved after such foresight to condemn them for their ingratitude and unbelief, John 3, 18. 19; Mark 16, 15.† . . . We must hold to the difference between the universal gracious will of God, according to which He meant it well also with unbelievers, and between the ordination, according to which, following His foresight, and seeing which would obediently accept His gracious will, He determined in regard to

* Schroeder knows nothing about a secret double will of God, containing for our reason an insolvable self-contradiction, namely 1) a universal will of salvation, which, as far as the fixed decree is concerned, demands and presupposes repentance and faith and for this reason depends also, as far as the outcome is concerned, on man's conduct; 2) a particular will of salvation, which at once fixes and guarantees the salvation of sinners in Adam, and accordingly executes itself by means of the infallible production of repentance and faith. This is nothing but a little Calvinistic Missourian invention! Calvinists, however, who taught this unequal will of grace differed to their advantage from Missouri in acknowledging openly that God's gracious will is, according to their belief, not the same for all men, but different in this and in that respect. Missouri, on the other hand, takes this beautiful term "predestination", and in reality teaches a second fundamentally different will of grace, and then denies the fact absolutely. But they will find their judge soon enough!

† "Why, that is our doctrine!" — Missouri cries — "We too teach that God resolved to condemn no one from the start, but only after foreseeing their unbelief and impenitence." — Well, it is very good of Missouri to teach this when it happens to suit. But every one can judge how the case stands according to Missouri. In the case of some, when God decided in regard to their "salvation or condemnation", He would not take the assistance of His foresight of human conduct, but simply set aside this foresight, and ordained at once that these sinners should not be condemned, that they "shall and must be saved." In the case of the rest, however, His foresight of their conduct was to decide the question: "Saved or damned?" And thus left to themselves and their own choice, their doom was sealed.

these that they should be eternally saved, in regard to the rest, however, who cast the Word of God from them, that they should be cast out from the grace of God." (P. 127.)

"They have the orthodox opinion who declare that no one is saved either absolutely or on account of the foreseen merit of works or of faith, to say nothing of teaching that any one is absolutely rejected. These, keeping the middle path, exclude (in opposition to the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians) the foresight of works and of faith, considered as meritorious; and on the other hand they speak (in opposition to those who forge an absolute decree) of the condition of faith, but in a manner entirely different from Semi-Pelagians. For they do not make faith depend on the powers of free will, but agree with the declaration of the synod of Orange (Arausio), where these remains of Pelagianism were rejected. This declaration is: 'No one can believe or persevere without the help of divine grace.' . . . Nor do they consider faith in so far as it is a virtue, a work, and a charisma in man, which imbues him with a new constitution, but in so far as it embraces and holds fast Christ the only and truly meritorious cause of our salvation. Considered in this manner, faith is so far removed from being taken as a meritorious cause of salvation and predestination, that the apostle places it in most striking opposition to good works or merits, and subordinates it to the divine grace and mercy. Eph. 2, 8. 9. Therefore, they do not say that we are elected for the sake of faith, as though foreseen faith were a cause of election, or that we are elected on account of the worthiness and the merit of faith, but 'in faith,' showing the condition which God, electing in grace, foresees and requires in man who is to be elected. And what they maintain they prove clearly by the Holy Scriptures." (Fascic. Controv. 1611. p. 572.)

LUKE OSIANDER, JR.

Luke Osiander, the younger* writes: "In regard to the will of God we must remember that it is only one, eternal, and constant, but that it is considered in a double aspect, according to

* Son of the older Luke Osiander, to whom Dr. Walther appealed, against his own conscience and better knowledge, in attempting to make his opponents Huberians. The younger L. O. was born 1571 at Stuttgart, was in the ministry since 1591, and afterwards professor at Tuebingen. The writing from which we quote was printed in 1605.

its twofold objects: that is in respect to those who follow God's will, and in respect to those who resist; i. e. that as God will save those believing in Christ, so also He will damn the unbelieving and despising. For better instruction the will of God is distinguished as antecedent and subsequent. The antecedent is the same as God's love, and is the good pleasure, the eternal counsel and decree of God desiring all men altogether, who were lost through sin, to be saved through the Savior Christ, who must be embraced by faith. The subsequent will, however, is the same as the election of God's children properly so-called, and is the eternal counsel or decree of God to save believers and to condemn unbelievers. The antecedent will, accordingly, or the love of God, is universal. The subsequent will, however, or the election, is particular, since it is limited by faith in Christ. But the cause of this particularity is not God,* but the perverted and wicked will of men who contemn and scorn the Word of God and the Gospel." (Handbook of Controversies with Calvinists, p. 212.)

The objection of the Calvinists, emphasized to-day also by Missouri, that Paul declares clearly: "God has mercy on whom He will have mercy, and hardens whom He will harden,"† is answered by Osiander as follows: "I reply: 1) Paul says 'whom

* As Missouri to-day teaches together with the Calvinists, saying: in the will of God lies the "mystery" for God's declaring on the one hand indeed that He would save all, but on the other hand making use of His sovereign right to have mercy on whom He will have mercy, although He could just as easily have had mercy on all.

† Of late, indeed, Missouri did not so fearlessly quote this passage in its absolutistic sense, as in the beginning. It is still a little repugnant to them to place beside their unconditional election unto salvation the self-evident reverse, the equally unconditional omission of the rest, although the "mystery" of the election already in reality includes both sides, and appears so mysterious only in this its connection, refusing to "harmonize" with the universal will of grace. But what miserable students of Scripture they must be who say, these words: "He hath mercy on whom He will have mercy", show that God here deals only according to His secret free will, without regarding in any way man's conduct; but these words: "He hardens, whom He will harden" are to be so understood that God does not here deal according to His secret mere good pleasure, but according to the revealed order of salvation, and does most exactly regard the conduct of men! Should not such "Scripture" theologians be switched thoroughly for their rascally insolence with which they twist the words of Holy Scripture according to their pleasure? Well, the rod will come in due time!

He will'; this our opponents interpret, as though God willed absolutely, without any antecedent cause, merely holding a military review, to save these and to damn those. But the Scriptures do not so speak of God's will, for they draw the line in His will with respect to faith and unbelief, repentance and impenitence. Christ Himself explains the Father's will: This is the will of Him that sent me, that whosoever seeth the Son and believeth on Him shall have everlasting life, John 6, 40. And John testifies, declaring: He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. John 3, 36. Whereas the Scriptures speak of the will of God in their customary manner, our opponents however in a new, stoic manner unknown to the Scriptures, they speak of an entirely different thing, and the argumentation lacks connection. 2) It is said of God that He hardens men, not absolutely and unconditionally, but He hardens those who obstinately despise, scorn, and blaspheme the Word, of whom therefore no unconditional hardening can be predicated." (P. 228.*)

The objection: "If God earnestly desires to have all men saved, why then does He not give faith to all?" is answered by Osiander as follows: "It is not God's fault, but the fault of men that all have not faith. For of God Paul declares: He now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because He hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead. Acts 17, 30. 31. But faith is not given of God immediately, but mediately, through the Word and the Sacraments through which God works faith in us. That many, therefore, do not obtain faith must be ascribed, not to God, but to wicked and perverted men who either do not hear the Word at all, keeping aloof from the workshop of the Holy Spirit, or hear

* Missouri, however, applies the word: "He hath mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardens", to the whole multitude of sinners, as they lie by nature in the same depravity and resistance. Here already, they tell us, without perceiving any difference on the part of men, He had mercy on some in such a way as to remove from them even their wilful resistance, while He could "just as easily" have removed it from all without exception! The "mystery" therefore is only, why He does not do this, why He "hardens whom He will harden." Two wills in God for sinners!

it superficially, or remain attached to the lusts and desires of their hearts, as the parables of Christ explain (Matt. 22; Luke 14.)" (P. 240.)

ALBERT GRAUER.

Albert Grauer* writes: "Although the will of God is in itself altogether simple and a unit, yet, as far as the act of willing is concerned, a double aspect results, namely in regard to the objects, when God's will occupies itself with His creatures. For certain things God wills absolutely, and these always take place, as for instance creation, the resurrection of the dead, etc., concerning which the Psalm (1153) declares: He hath done whatsoever He hath pleased. And Paul (Rom. 9): For who hath resisted His will? Of this act of His will we are not speaking here. Other things, however, God wills conditionally, only if the condition is fulfilled. And these things God indeed wills earnestly, but they do not always take place, because the appended condition is not always fulfilled. Concerning such things we must understand the passages: All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people; How often would I have gathered thy children together, etc. And of such acts of will we speak, when we say that God wills the salvation of all and of every one." (Absurda Calvinistica, p. 231.)

"From these (Eph. 1, 4; 2 Thess. 2, 13; John 1, 12; Heb. 11, 6; Mark 16, 16; John 3, 18) and similar passages we conclude with assurance: 1) That the decree concerning the selection of those to be saved is not absolute, but limited in Christ as embraced by faith, so that God's will indeed is the first efficient cause of our salvation and also of our election, but Christ and His merit apprehended by faith the impelling and meritorious cause; 2) we conclude from the above passages that the decree of reprobation

---

* Born 1575 near Perleberg in Brandenburg, where his father was pastor. He studied at Rostock (therefore under Chytræus), at Frankfurt on the Oder (under Corner), at Jena, and at Wittenberg, where he was made Magister. Afterwards he was made professor at Jena, and finally General Superintendent at Weimar, where he died in 1617. On account of his many excellent writings in defense of the Lutheran Confession he was called "the shield and sword of Lutheranism." The Absurda Calvinistica was published in 1605.

is not unconditional, but that its cause is the sins of men, and these in so far as they are connected with persistent impenitence."*

"If we have been elected unto eternal life absolutely, only for the sake of the will of God, without the consideration of Christ embraced by faith, and if thus the will of God alone, without Christ as embraced by faith, is the cause of our election, then it follows that we are also justified and saved absolutely, only for the sake of the will of God, without the consideration of Christ embraced by faith, and that only the will of God, without the consideration of Christ's merit as embraced by faith, is the cause of our salvation. Our right to draw this conclusion is self-evident: for we are justified and saved in time as God in eternity determined to justify and save us." (Page 244.†)

"The elect please God, as the Scriptures everywhere testify. But the elect are regarded in the decree of selection as having no faith; for according to the Calvinists faith is no constituent

* Grauer declares that Lutherans conclude from these passages, which treat of the universal will of grace and the universal order of grace, that the decree of election as well as that of reprobation is not absolute and regardless. The Calvinists made election in realty an unconditional selection (with an unconditional omission of the rest), without concerning themselves about the rest of the teaching of Scripture regarding the will of God respecting the salvation of all men. Missouri has discovered a new middle path. They tell us that the passages treating of the selection need not harmonize with the universal Gospel; those, however, treating of non-election must harmonize with the doctrine of the universal will of grace. The selection, therefore, they say, is an unrevealed mystery, non-election on the other hand something clearly revealed — and still again the real mystery! !

† Note that according to Grauer there is no third possibility between a selection for salvation "absolute, only on account of God's will", and a selection "in consideration of Christ embraced by faith." According to the Lutheran view of the Gospel there can be no third, since Christ's merit has absolutely nothing particular in it, and therefore cannot be in itself the cause of a particular result. According to the Calvinistic opinion the particular merit of Christ, as they view it, could indeed be the corresponding cause of a particular decree for the bestowal of salvation. To be sure, this wonderful piece of wisdom, that Christ's universal merit considered in itself, without its appropriation or application, produces a particular election in God, whereas God earnestly desires to save all men — remained to be discovered by the reformer of the 19th century. — Note further: That which is a cause in the execution must also be a cause in the decree itself; and vice versa: That which is no cause in the decree regarding the salvation only of certain persons cannot be a real cause in the execution of this decree.

part of the decree of election, but only a subordinate effect,* and can in no way (according to their notion) be an instrumental cause of election; in fact, no attention whatever is paid to faith in the decree itself. Consequently, some men" (according to Calvinistic doctrine) "please God without faith, in the decree itself. For the same cause the elect will please God also without Christ, in the decree of election itself, since without faith Christ would benefit no man and no one could have part in Him." (Page 246.)

"As we are justified for Christ's sake, so also we are predestinated for Christ's sake, as Zanchius" (a Calvinist) "testifies in the words quoted. But we are justified for Christ's sake in this manner, that Christ embraced by faith is the cause of our justification, God being impelled by Christ as embraced by faith to justify us; and not the mere will of God is the cause of justification, as the Scriptures testify everywhere. This deduction evidently upsets the dogma of Calvin" (and of Dr. Walther). "Nor is there any reason to object that neither faith nor Christ's merit did then actually exist. I know this, but reply that Paul declares, Rom. 8, and Peter in his first Epistle, chapter 1, that we are elected according to the prognosis of God, and here prognosis cannot signify the same as predestination,† for Paul distinguishes between these words by means of a gradation: Whom He did foreknow (praescivit), them He also did predestinate." (Page 250.)

"If in the decree of election no attention was paid to faith (I speak not of its execution, but of the decree itself) then it follows that Paul wrote falsely, 2 Thess. 2, 13: God has chosen us unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth. But according to the Calvinists no attention was paid to faith in the decree of election itself, as their words just quoted shows.‡ Consequently, Paul must have contradicted the truth

* Self-evidently an effect "decreed along" with everything else, a necessary means for obtaining salvation. But when Missouri declares that the Calvinists did not even admit faith as a decreed means of salvation, it lies again. To lie in all directions has come to be their second nature. They indeed know better, but they are compelled to lie.

† As Calvinists and Missourians claim. Please don't think of Samson's foxes!

‡ And this in principle constitutes the Harmonia Calvino-Missouriana. Faith in Christ, or the appropriation of Christ's merit is not to be the presupposition of the decree of election separating the whole multitude of sinners into such as shall be saved and such as shall not be saved, but only

when he wrote, that God chose us unto salvation in belief of the truth. But this conclusion is absurd and wicked. Furthermore: If election took place in belief of the truth, it did not take place according to the mere good pleasure of the divine will. But I would have it noted that faith is here considered not according to its own worthiness, in so far as it constitutes a certain qualification, for it is not so considered in justification, but in relation to its object, namely Christ. Hence we say here: not for the sake of faith as a merit (propter), but through (per) faith as a means, or for the sake of Christ's merit as embraced by faith. We know too that faith as it exists in reality is a result of election, yet it is not for this reason absurd to say that foreseen faith as such (ut praevisa) and considered with regard to Christ's merit is an instrumental cause in relation to ourselves, for even Christ's merit, or His suffering, is a result of predestination* and still in its way also a cause, since God elected according to His prognosis. In fact, the Calvinists themselves declare that the glory and praise of God and the revelation of His mercy is the cause of predestination and at the same time its effect." (Page 251.)

"If it is Pelagian to teach that foreseen faith is an instrumental cause of election and that in the decree of election faith was taken into consideration, then it follows that it must likewise be Pelagian to teach that faith as it exists in fact is an instrumental cause of justification and that in justification faith was taken into consideration. The point of proof is this: In every respect just as faith actually present is related to justification, so also faith foreseen is related to election.† Hence, whatever is objected to

---

an annex or appendage of this decree of separation, only a means decreed along, and a point of transition. Faith, we are told, has nothing to do with the election as such, this is governed only by the "secret pleasure" and mere good pleasure of God.

* For if God in eternity, before the foundation of the world, had instituted no counsel of salvation and no predestination, the Son would not have come into the world to redeem sinners, and the Holy Spirit would not have been sent to sanctify them.

† Here again we have the "Proton pseudos", the fundamental error of the present opponents of Missouri, namely that foreseen faith is related to election just as actual faith is related to justification. It is remarkable indeed that the present opponents of Missouri always bring up the same "heresies" which our Lutheran fathers, even back to the F. C. men, maintained in opposition to Calvinism! And still more remarkable, that we are told, these opponents of Missouri have "laid the wicked egg of their synergistic Pelagian doctrine of predestination" only now! We already rejoice

foreseen faith as considered in election must likewise be objected to faith actually present as considered in justification, and applies there in the same way. For justification is the execution of the decree of election. Therefore, just as justification is of grace and still faith is not excluded, so also election is indeed of grace, but faith is not on this account excluded. For this reason Paul in his letter to the Romans argues from election to justification,* which argument would have no validity, if faith had to be excluded from the decree of election." (Page 253.)

JOHN FOERSTER.

John Foerster, the younger† writes: "The will of God's good pleasure is, according to the exceedingly useful distinction introduced by Damascenus, twofold: the antecedent and the subsequent will of God. The former is the burning desire of God, wishing earnestly, constantly, and fervently that all men may be saved through Christ embraced by faith. Damascenus: 'We must know that God wills antecedently that all may be saved and become partakers of His kingdom. For He did not create us to the end that we should suffer punishment, but that we may partake of His goodness as He Himself is good.' This is the decree of this will: I will and decree that all men may believe in Christ and be saved. As this is shown by the passages of Scripture which treat of this will. Ezek. 18 and 33; 1 Tim. 2, 4; 2 Peter 3, 9. . . . The subsequent will is not contradictory to the antecedent, but subordinate to it.‡ This

---

in thinking of the time when all this will be finally investigated. "That day will make it clear." Does St. Louis also rejoice to think of it?

* If this is so, then Paul already and the Holy Spirit harbored this "fundamental error", that election and justification are analoga, articles of faith corresponding to each other, articles which must for this reason harmonize with each other! The F. C is self-evidently entangled in the same "fundamental error" — and in a few others. We shall see!

†Born 1576 at Aurbach; studied at Leipzig under Mylius and Schmuck; was made Doctor of Theology in 1603 and professor at Wittenberg in 1609. His Thesaurus Catecheticus he did not publish till 1610.

‡ Missouri, to be sure, very naturally hates this distinction employed by our Lutheran fathers as a mediation which destroys the (Calvinistic Missourian) "mystery" of the particularity of election. Missourians prefer to teach two irreconcilable wills in God, of which they say: They not only apparently contradict each other; but the contradiction is an

appears clearly from the precious passage: God so loved the world . . . that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. In the same way from the parables concerning the great supper, Luke 14, and concerning the royal marriage feast, Matt. 22. There are, moreover, in this subsequent will of God, two decrees corresponding to each other, in regard to two classes of men: believers and unbelievers. The one decree is that of election unto life, which pertains to believers and declares: I will and decree that all who believe perseveringly in Christ shall have eternal life. The other decree is that of the judgment and the rejection unto damnation, which pertains to unbelievers and has for its contents: I will and decree that all who do not believe perseveringly in Christ shall perish and be condemned. These passages speak of the will of election: John 6, 40: This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have everlasting life. 1 Cor. 1, 21: It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. . . . The antecedent will refers to the granting of salvation on the part of God, as He offers it earnestly to all men through the means they are to use. The subsequent will refers to the acceptance of salvation on the part of men, who are either made actual partakers of it through the means properly employed, or are not made partakers because they have obstinately rejected the means. Predestination must be sought not in the antecedent but in the subsequent will of

---

actual reality. For they teach 1) a (universal) will of grace according to which God wills to receive in grace, to justify, and to save only those who repent and believe as such, stringently excluding all who are still unconverted and without faith. We say "wills" with emphasis; for it is the essence of the universal will of grace to limit the actual participation in the blessings of salvation (whether they be considered before, in, or after time) to believers as such; and this universal will wills to form a fixed decree concerning the actual bestowal of salvation only in regard to believers and in regard to no one without faith. So then even the elect, in so far as they are considered as still being without faith, would be excluded from the decree bestowing salvation by this limitation in the universal will of grace, because they would still be without Christ. But 2) Missouri teaches its "predestination" as a second will of grace, which decrees firmly in regard to men without faith, they shall and must be saved. So then God, according to one will, excludes the elect from His ordination, and according to the other He includes them, considering them in both instances as without faith; in fact this faithless condition formed the reason for their preliminary exclusion!

God. For to constitute it the mercy of God alone and the universal merit of Christ do not suffice; the entire order of predestination (taxis prooristike) is demanded in addition, for the decree of predestination depends on this complete order."* (Thes. Catech. 3rd petition.)

JOHN GERHARD.

John Gerhard† writes: "Christ's merit is the cause of our election. But since Christ's merit benefits no one without faith, we say that regard to faith must be included in the decree of election. We confess with a loud voice that we teach that God found nothing good in man who was to be elected unto eternal life, because He did not so regard either good works or the use of the free will, or even faith, that, moved thereby, or on this account He elected some. On the contrary, we say that the one and only merit of Christ was the thing whose worthiness God considered, and that in mere grace He formed the decree of election. Since, however, Christ's merit is found in man only through faith, we teach that election took place in view of the

* What a glorious unanimity in regard to the Ekloge among all these theologians who had grown up in the time and in the Church of the F. C.! He who would not make himself utterly ridiculous, who would not shamefully slander the Lutheran Church in its very prime and in the period of its greatest glory, dare not assume that all these original subscribers, and in addition the entire original Church of the F. C,, either never understood their own Confession, or one and all at once deviated and fell away from it. And if those of St. Louis were honorable men and no counterfeiters and falsifiers of history, they would not have refused to pay proper attention to this historical side of the case.

† Born 1582 at Quedlinburg; studied Medicine since 1599 at Wittenberg; went to Jena in 1603 and studied theology; also at Marburg in 1604. In 1605 he began to give theological lectures at Jena "mit Ruhm." In 1606 he was made Superintendent at Heldburg and professor of theology in the Seminary at Coburg. Since 1615 he labored as professor at Jena, where he died in 1637. — Gerhard studied at three universities under men who had all been defenders of the F. C. already at the time of its adoption and most of whom had been actual subscribers. He grew up — so to speak — in the pure air of the F. C. And the entire Lutheran Church at that time — from one end of it to the other, in the north as in the south, in the east as in the west — is thoroughly unanimous against the Calvinists on this point, that the limitation of God's will of grace, which appears in His elective decree regarding the bestowal of salvation only upon certain sinners, is due to the foreseen difference between those believing in Christ and those wilfully rejecting their salvation.

merit of Christ apprehended by faith. We say, therefore, that those all and those alone were elected of God from eternity unto salvation, of whom He foresaw that by the efficacy of the Holy Spirit and through the ministration of the Gospel they would truly believe in Christ the Redeemer and persevere to the end of life."* (Loc. de El. § 161.)

"We briefly state the reasons for this our proposition.† — 1) Election took place in Christ, Eph. 1, 4. But we are not in Christ except through faith, Eph. 3, 17. Therefore, the mellontas pisteuein (those who will believe in the future, 1 Tim. 1, 16) are the elect. 2) Furthermore: Election is the eternal decree of God to justify and save men. But God justifies and saves men in time only through faith, Rom. 3, 4; Gal. 2, 3; Eph. 2, 8. Therefore also, He decreed from eternity to justify and save only those who will believe (credituros), and consequently He elected those only and those all of whom He foresaw that they would remain in Christ through faith. 3) No one is elected out-

* In spite of their ugly cry: "Fathers! fathers!" Missouri would like exceedingly to have it appear, as though after all in the chief points these decried "fathers" are on her side, and that we opponents were entirely wrong in appealing to the utterances of the fathers and to their contention against the Calvinists respecting the Intuitu fidei. And how does Missouri proceed to save appearances? Why the fathers are quoted as Dr. Walther always quotes the above testimony of Gerhard; he begins with the words: "We confess with a loud voice", and breaks off with the words: "in mere grace He formed the decree of election." All that precedes and all that follows, as we have given it in full above, Dr. Walther nicely leaves out, so that the impression may not be spoiled which these words, torn from their connection, must make upon unsuspicious readers, when quoted alone as done by Dr. Walther. In general, the mode and manner in which Dr. Walther in this "most recent controversy" has quoted the fathers — for instance Dannhauer, Seb. Schmidt, Kromayer, Knoes — is that of the most ordinary falsifier of history or that of the most conscienceless pettifogger. By leaving out the chief passages he turns their testimony to suit his every notion. But God will judge this mode of combat!

† To be sure, the St. Louis reformers — the most humble men on earth — have long ago decided that all our Lutheran fathers with all their arguments against the Calvinistic denial of the intuitu fidei were entirely wide of the mark, and that the Calvinists, as regards this chief point, agreed completely with the Scriptures and with the Lutheran Confession itself in opposition to the whole Lutheran theology and Church. But we make bold, since in any case we have been excommunicated by the St. Louis curia (extremes evidently meet here most strikingly!) to quote the arguments of our Lutheran fathers from their own lips. We are not altogether

side of Christ. Sinful men viewed as without faith are outside of Christ. Therefore sinful men viewed as without faith were not elected. As Paul accordingly declares Eph. 1, 4, that God elected us in Christ, so he declares 2 Thess. 2, 13, that God elected us in faith, since we could not be elected in Christ except in view of faith which embraces Christ. 4) Without faith it is impossible to please God, Heb. 11, 6. The elect have pleased God from eternity, because the kingdom is prepared for them from eternity, Matt. 25, 34. Therefore, only in view of faith apprehending Christ. 5) Thence flow these descriptions of the elect in the Scriptures, 1 Tim. 1, 16: Christ did shew forth (says Paul) all longsuffering in me for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting. James 2, 5: God hath chosen the poor of this world rich in faith. Tit. 1, 1: The faith of God's elect." (§ 162.)

"We say the impelling cause of election is Christ's merit embraced by faith. The sense is this: God did not at all elect some through an unconditional grace unto eternal life and reject others through an unconditional hatred unto eternal death. Nor did He elect some unto life because of their own merit; on the contrary, in His counsel of election He took into consideration only and solely the perfect and sufficient merit of His Son. By this He allowed Himself to be moved to elect some unto eternal life, namely those all and those alone of whom He foresaw that they would apprehend Christ's merit by faith and persevere in this faith till the end of life. Those, however, of whom He foresaw that they would not accept this merit, but would remain in impenitence and unbelief till the end of life, He rejected unto death. For the merit of Christ comes into consideration in the decree of election not merely in respect to its acquisition, in which regard it extends to all men, but also in respect to its appropriation, in so far as it is apprehended by true and steadfast faith. From this it is clear that the inner impelling cause of election is not Christ's merit in and for itself, or as considered

alone with our weapons on the field of battle. It is an old truth we are defending with old weapons against new foes and traitors in the Lutheran camp. It may be a great comfort for our opponents to operate against our fathers with the ostensibly reformatory cry: "Fathers! fathers! — Away with the fathers!" Nevertheless, it is also a comfort for us, and that in no small measure, to battle beneath the shadow of our Lutheran fathers against this new Calvinism. There is here also a Lutheran understanding of Scripture.

without the appropriation, but the merit of Christ as apprehended by faith." (Disp. Isag. p. 711.)

"Nothing can be named as having been regarded by God in His eternal decree of election save Christ embraced by faith; or, which is the same, faith apprehending Christ. God did not regard our works, nor our worthiness, nor the use of the free will, but only the merit of Christ. Since this, however, is imputed to no one without faith, it is said that He regarded faith, and that He did this from eternity, since He foreknew which would believe and which would remain in unbelief." (P. 721.)

"The good pleasure of the will of God, according to which election took place, does not exclude the view of faith, because it does not exclude Christ. Because Christ does not become ours except through faith, therefore the consideration of faith is a constituent part of election." (P. 725.)

"To teach that the view of faith is a constituent part of the decree of election is not Pelagian, for the Pelagians taught that election took place according to foreseen faith as a certain merit and as a work of the natural powers of free will, in which sense our pious fathers, when disputing with Pelagians, justly denied that election took place for the sake of faith and from faith.

But we teach that faith is a gracious gift of God, and not a merit, but a means through which we apprehend Christ's merit for whose sake election took place; and that thus faith is a part of the order which God established in election. If it were Pelagian to put faith in relation to election in this sense, it would have to be Pelagian also to say that we are justified by faith." (P. 725.)

JUSTUS FEUERBORN.

Justus Feuerborn* writes: "These self-contradicting people (the Reformed of Cassel) admit that the decree of eternal election is not absolute consequenter et ratione executionis (subsequently and in respect to its execution) in view of the means through which it is brought about and worked out in the elect.

* Born 1587 at Hevorden in Westphalia; he studied Law at first, then Theology in Stadthagen and in Giessen; was made professor at Giessen and at Marburg. Died 1656. The "Thorough Elaboration" is probably the finest work ever written against Calvinism and deserved the general acknowledgement it received. Jena, Leipzig, and Wittenberg published their approbation of the work.

(As also Theoph. Neuberger, the present court-preacher at Cassel, writes in his 'Golden Treasure of Paul,' p. 31: 'Predestination is by no means a mere simple decree of God, as though He had simply willed to save us or decreed to save us without Christ, without the Word and Sacrament, without repentance and faith. For just as God decreed the end, namely to save men, so also He appointed the means whereby we can obtain such salvation.' So far Neuberger.) Although, we say, our opponents admit this, which is the point of controversy, they nevertheless teach that the decree of election is absolute antecedenter (antecedently), in and for itself; and in this view of it excludes the merit of our Lord Christ, apprehended steadfastly and perseveringly by the elect in true faith, through divine enlightenment, according to the foreknowledge of God; and excludes it so completely that they say the cause, why God did not elect and ordain all unto eternal life but only a few, these, those, in preference to others, is nothing but the divine beneplacitum and good pleasure. And this is the point of controversy for both sides." ("Thorough Refutation of the Darmstætter, p. 12.*)

"Although on our side the expression prevails somewhat, that faith is a cause of divine election,† it is never understood of a meritorious or impelling cause or of a cause originating wholly or in part from the powers of our depraved nature (which is altogether dead in sins prior to regeneration), but only of a causa instrumentalis, of an instrumental cause, which God works in us through grace (to whom alone, and not to us, honor is due). Although Dr. Crocius bears witness that we do not here understand an impelling and meritorious cause, yet the present court-preacher of Cassel, Neuberger, misinterprets our meaning, as though we (whom he does not name directly, but only hints at) held that God elected us unto eternal life for the sake of our foreseen faith, and that He was thereby moved and induced to elect us. This is far from our thought, for we consider faith only as an organon apprehensivum, a means for apprehending, both in

* In the margin we read: "Those of lower Hessia (Reformed) and their adherents have not yet expressed themselves regarding the mere divine decree in the eternal election and reprobation of men so that we could be satisfied, but at times hide the real thought of their hearts." Whom does this strike?

† In the margin: "In which sense faith is considered and termed a cause of divine predestination." — Calvin and Missouri of course reply in short: In none whatever!

the article concerning the gracious justification and salvation of a repentant sinner before God, and in the article concerning predestination. But Dr. Crocius, on the other hand, teaches in the place referred to that the divine predestination is absolutely free, exempt, and separate from any instrumental cause. And yet he will not wholly admit true, persevering faith, which God foresaw before the foundation of the world, and determined to give us and did in time actually give us in pure divine mercy, for the sake of the precious merit of Jesus Christ, through the divine Word and Sacraments, is a meritorious cause of divine predestination. Him, as also his companions in the faith, we contradict justly and teach from the Holy Scriptures that we are elected unto eternal life through faith as an instrumental cause, according to the divine prescience, before the foundation of the world. And this we do not understand as though our Lord God had used our faith as a tool and instrument, quo ipse actum electionis aeterna produxerit et ediderit, with which He produced, worked out and brought about our eternal election. For it is not for naught that divine election is an inner divine act and work requiring no outward instrument. Just as our Lord God does not for Himself and on His part need to produce and cause ipsum justificationis et salvationis actum, justification and salvation by an outward instrument. How is faith a causa instrumentalis and an instrument of divine election unto eternal life? This will appear clearly from the following. In divine election we dare not tear the persons from the means, nor these from those, but we must carefully take them together. The persons are: God (Father, Son, namely theanthropos, our Mediator and Redeemer Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit), who elected us from eternity unto salvation; and then the elect. The means on God's part for offering and bestowing are, in God's foreknowledge and appointment, His Holy Word, written, preached, and heard, and the Sacraments as used, through which He determined to offer and bestow upon us, and does in time offer and bestow on us, His grace and the heavenly gifts and treasures obtained for us through Christ's merit. The means on our part, on the part of the elect, for apprehending and appropriating, by which through divine enlightenment we apprehend and appropriate the grace of God and the merit of Christ, is, also according to God's provision, faith given us through pure divine grace. When now we consider in election God, the One who elects, His electing grace, Christ's merit, earn-

ing for us God's election or that we are elected unto eternal life, and the Word and Sacraments, then our faith is not the instrument whereby God made His decree, or brought forth His grace, or whereby Christ in actum deducerit and worked out His merit and brought to light the Word and the Sacraments of God and bestowed them upon us. But now we consider that God the Lord elects a few men unto eternal life, in pure grace indeed, yet not outside of and without Christ, but only in Christ, the Mediator, Redeemer, and Savior of the whole world. And we continue to consider that true faith alone, and nothing else, is the sole means and as it were the sole spiritual hand, with which on our part we apprehend the divine grace and the obedience and merit of the Lord Christ and apply and appropriate it and make it our own, thus being embodied in Christ. (In this divine grace and for the sake of the obedience and merit of Christ, which earned election for us, we are ordained and chosen unto eternal life; and in the divine Word and Sacraments, which God graciously appointed for our conversion, and through the divine mercy, and accordingly not at all through our own natural powers, faith apprehends God's grace and Christ's obedience and merit.) Therefore, considering all this, we are right in saying that our true, persevering faith, which God before the foundation of the world determined to grant us, and which He foresaw, and which He did in time grant and preserve in us through the divine Word and Sacraments according to the divine order—we are right in saying, this faith is an organum or instrumentum of predestination. And through it we are made partakers of the elective grace of God and of the merit of Christ, for the sake of which we are elected, in and through the Word of God and the Sacraments; and thus we are elected of God unto salvation from the beginning in sanctification of the Spirit and in (and by no means outside of or without) belief of the truth, 2 Thess. 2, 13, . . . according to God's foreknowledge, Rom. 8, 29; 11, 2; 1 Peter 1, 1-2.* Just as we are justified through faith† and saved in time

* The last five sentences are one grand sentence in Feuerborn's German. No man on earth can translate them as one intelligible sentence in English. In fact, this is the severest sentence we have met in the entire translation. We have been satisfied to render the sense in English, without attempting any elegance or smoothness in form. — R. C. H. Lenski.

† How remarkable that these Lutheran fathers persist in drawing a parallel between election unto salvation and justification as far as the relation of faith to both is concerned! If only they had kept their wisdom

while we live in this world, Hab. 2, 4; Gal. 2, 10; Phil. 3. 9. . . . Inasmuch as God elected us unto eternal salvation, not outside of or without, but in Christ (and in Him not as rejected by persistent unbelief, but as embraced by steadfast faith through divine enlightenment and preservation), and yet in faith (which God foresaw from eternity) in Christ, who also was foreordained before the foundation of the world, 1 Peter 1, 20. Since now we have so often and frequently explained ourselves thoroughly and correctly on this matter, and have firmly refuted the accusation, that we have been guilty at least of the error of Semi-Pelagianism and a half-Pelagianism, it would certainly be time now for our opponents to turn and repent and to dispel and drive away their darkness by the clear beams of the brightly shining truth." (Page 22-24.*)

NICOLAS HUNNIUS.

Nicolas Hunnius† writes in his renowned "Dogmatics" or "Glaubenshere": "We accordingly see in this king and in this master of the house (Matt. 22; Luke 14, 16) a twofold will, 1)

to themselves, until the reformers of St. Louis let their light shine in this enlightened century to the exceeding delight of the faithful parrot-choir!

* As then, so now. Calvinists hardened their hearts in spite of it all. Missouri does the same, wipes its mouth and raves on with its true ancestors: "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?" See the May number of "L. u. W.", p. 185. Mr. F. P. certainly does not need to paint the devil on the wall. Missouri complains with evident injustice, when it whines and caterwauls as often as it is reminded that its doctrine, as far as historic Lutheranism is concerned, is Calvinizing both thetically and antithetically. What our theologians considered a fundamental article (election intuitu fidei) Missouri together with the Calvinists rejects as false doctrine, synergistic, Semi-Pelagian, rationalizing, etc., and fairly plunders the Calvinistic arsenal to secure weapons against Lutherans. But it will not escape its just judgment. When the snows melt, it will appear!

† A son of the older Ægidius Hunnius, who together with his colleagues Rhoding and Arcularius signed the F. C. in Marburg in 1577, and who was the most important theologian in the Lutheran Church for 20 years in the time of the F. C. Nicolas was born at Marburg in 1585; studied at Wittenberg; was made Magister in 1604 and professor of theology in Wittenberg in 1617. In 1855 Dr. Walther in his "Lutheran Theological Library for Pastors" ("L. u. W.", vol. 1, p. 294 and 341) recommends J. Gerhard's Loci and J. W. Baier's Compendium as Latin, and N. Hunnius' "Glaubenslehre", as a German representative of orthodox Lutheran dogmatics. These three were the only ones named! At that

a will of grace and joy, according to which they desire that it may be well with their invited guests, and that these may partake of their blessings with joy; 2) a will of judgment, and according to this they desire that their invited guest because of great ingratitude and contempt may not partake of their blessings nor in reality experience their grace and kindness. These two wills are not in the least contrary to one another, although the one would grant the feast to the guests, and the other would not grant it. Similarly, therefore, our Lord God also has two wills; one of which is the will of grace, which the church-fathers have called the antecedent will, because it does not regard man's piety or wickedness, thankfulness or unthankfulness, obedience or disobedience, but notwithstanding this offers grace and salvation to all without distinction. The other is the will of judgment, which the church-fathers have called subsequent, or the will that follows, because it follows upon the conduct of men toward the kind and gracious offer of God, so that since they have rejected and despised this offer, it in turn meets them with merited disfavor and severe condemnation and casts them away. As God, therefore, according to His will of grace, desires the welfare of all men, so, according to His will of judgment, He desires that those alone shall obtain everlasting salvation who have accepted His proffered grace, but that those who reject it shall not enjoy this grace. God proceeds in this matter like a pious godly government, which would desire nothing more than that it may be well with all its citizens; to this end it admonishes them with all earnestness and kindness, and even pleads with them, that they may consider their own welfare and conduct themselves so that their wishes may be fulfilled. But if this kindness is rejected, if the citizen will not listen to the admonition and pleading of his government, if he derides it and wickedly transgresses its will and command, then this will of grace ends en-

---

time, however, nothing was said, not even the slightest "grain" was mentioned, to the effect that these very three dogmaticians had also "deviated from the Scriptures and the Symbol" in their doctrine of election — or that they "attempted to explain the mystery of election and to make it plausible to reason" — or that they had introduced a "synergistic Pelagian doctrine of predestination." And yet how necessary it would have been in this article which concerns the very foundation of salvation! But at that time the fathers and their writings were always "acknowledged as orthodox" etc.; for Dr. Walther could so (and only so) make such extensive use of them against his opponents at that time! !

tirely, and there follows the will of judgment, according to which the government desires that it may not be well with such a disobedient and wicked fellow, but proceeds to hand him over to the executioner that he may be brought from life unto death. Therefore, as in all this neither the king and master of the house nor the government contradict themselves, although they will and do not will something according to a certain distinction; so also God does not contradict Himself, when, according to a certain distinction, He wills the everlasting salvation of all men, and does not will the salvation of some." (P. 123.)

"What then did God consider in predestination and what moved Him that He preferred one man to another, elected some and did not elect others? Here we must remember:

1) God considered solely and only Jesus Christ alone in predestination. This is established by the Scripture testimonies hitherto adduced; Eph. 1, 4: 'He hath chosen us in Christ'; Eph. 1, 5: 'He has predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ'; 2 Tim. 1, 9: 'God hath saved us according to His own grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began'; 'through Christ men are reconciled to God' (2 Cor. 5, 19); 'grace came by Jesus Christ' (John 1, 17); 'God hath made us accepted in the Beloved,' that is in His Son (Eph. 1, 6); 'neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved, save in the name of Jesus' (Acts 4, 12).

2) God considered Jesus Christ in predestination, not in so far as He suffered for all men and made atonement for their sin. (For in this respect all men are alike and there is no difference or choice to be made between them, inasmuch as Christ bore the sins of all, as will be shown hereafter.) But

3) God considered Jesus Christ in predestination, in so far as He is accepted of men. For he to whom God shows especial grace, manifesting and witnessing His complete love, as having been now reconciled indeed, has assuredly received and accepted the Lord Christ (who reconciled and brought him to grace) as the one, through whom he is reconciled not only according to merit, but also in fact. Now predestination is a work of God in which He manifests His complete love toward those whom He elects, and bears them witness that they are indeed reconciled unto Himself. Therefore it follows that they whom God elects have received and accepted the Lord Christ, the throne of grace.

The Lord Christ, however, is accepted on the part of men only by faith. What faith is will be reported hereafter. Now it is enough to know that it is the assurance by which each one is certain for himself that God is gracious to him, has remitted his sins, and will receive him as an heir of eternal life, because His beloved Son has in His own body borne his sins, atoned for them and so cleansed him with His blood that he, being reconciled to God, dare come to Him in all confidence. He who has such confidence thereby grasps the divine gracious promises, together with the entire merit of the Lord Christ, and makes all this his own. This is faith through which Christ is received into our hearts and dwells therein, Eph. 3, 17, concerning which the Epistle to the Hebrews, 11, 6, declares: 'Without faith it is impossible to please God.' On the other hand, the Lord Christ is rejected only by unbelief. For Paul and Barnabas declare to the hardened and stiff-necked Jews at Antioch: 'It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing you put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles.' Acts 13, 46. Accordingly,

4) God considered in predestination that in some men the Lord Christ dwells with His merit and acquired righteousness; and because they are thereby completely reconciled unto Himself, He elected them unto eternal life. On the other hand, He considered that in some men there is no faith, that accordingly Christ is rejected on their part by unbelief, and that they, not partaking of His righteousness and merit, still lie in their sins and have the divine wrath abiding upon them; consequently He found them outside of Christ and thus did not elect them unto life.

And this constitutes the difference between those whom God elects and those whom He does not elect, some are in Christ, some outside of Him, some believe, others do not believe; just as this distinguished those who are saved and those who are damned, John 3, 18: 'He that believeth on the Son is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already'; John 3, 36: 'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.'

5) God considered in predestination the faith of men, so that He elects believers and does not elect unbelievers. Not

as though faith in itself bestowed a worthiness on man which could move God to this work of grace, and for the sake of which He could elect a man, but only in so far as faith is the means whereby the Lord Christ is joined to man, and whereby His innocence, righteousness, and merit (which, properly speaking, God considered in predestination) are given and bestowed upon them. Just as God justifies and saves us through faith; for He does not justify and save a man for the sake of faith and on account of its worthiness, but through faith, in so far as it embraces the Lord Christ's merit and righteousness, for the sake of which he is justified and saved.

6) God considered the Lord Christ in predestination, not only as by faith He dwells in the hearts of men, but also as He remains and abides in them till their end and the time of their departure. For, as salvation is promised to those alone who persevere steadfastly in their faith till the end, so also God ordained unto eternal life those of whom He foresaw that they would persevere steadfastly in their faith till the end; according to the word of the Lord Christ, Matt. 10, 22: 'He that endureth to the end shall be saved.' On the other hand, those who fall away from saving faith will receive far greater damnation than the rest, and the faith they had for a time benefits them nothing, their latter end being worse than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them, 2 Peter 2, 20. 21." (P. 131.)

CONRAD DIETRICH.

Conrad Dietrich* writes: "The Scriptures declare explicitly that election took place only in Christ, Eph. 1, 4; and we are not in Christ save by faith, Col. 1, 33; yet all men have not faith, 2 Thess. 3, 2; for true and steadfast faith is found only in the elect, Tit. 1, 1. How then can election, which took place in Christ through faith, be ascribed to all men? — These same Holy

* Born 1575 in Hessia; studied at Marburg under Arcularius, Winkelmann, and Hunnius; was made Magister in 1593; since 1614 Superintendent at Ulm, where he died in 1639. He was the author of the so-called "Dietrich's Catechism", which has been reprinted by the Missouri Synod with additions and alterations under the name of John Conrad Dietrich, a nephew of our Conrad.

Scriptures distinguish closely between the elect and the non-elect, between believers and non-believers, Matt. 24, 24; John 15, 19; 17, 6. 9; Rom. 9, 15. 18; 1 Cor. 1, 27; and only those are called the elect who obtain salvation and who believe, Rom. 8, 23. 30." (Analysis Evang. 1. 284.)

"What the Gospel offers us for our salvation requires faith, John 20, 31. Now the grace of God in Christ is offered us in the Gospel for our salvation, through and for the sake of the merit of Christ unto eternal life, 2 Thess. 1, 11. 12. Hence faith is here required. For what grace of God is there without Christ's merit? There is none. And therefore also no justification, no bestowal of salvation, no election. But of what benefit is Christ's merit if it is not appropriated? Now it can be applied to us only by faith. Therefore the Calvinists err in actually expelling faith altogether from election, which they think is unconditional, and in asserting that the Scripture testimonies cited by us (John 6, 40; 2 Thess. 2, 13; James 2, 5; 1 Cor. 1, 21) treat only of the execution of election, which takes place through faith." (Cateches. p. 457.*)

"Whatever God wills unconditionally and absolutely takes place unconditionally, always, and in an unchangeable manner. Ps. 115, 3; 33, 9. Rom. 4, 17. But He does not will our salvation in this way. On the other hand, whatever He wills in a definite way and with a certain condition does not take place unless the condition is fulfilled. Thus God wills that all men may be saved, but with the condition that they believe through the Word and appropriate Christ's merit through faith; where this condition is omitted, neglected, or wrongly applied, the opposite takes place through the just judgment of God. — Others follow Damascenus and distinguish between the antecedent will, according to which God desires that all men without exception may be saved through faith in Christ as offered in the preaching of the Gospel, and the subsequent will, according to which He saves only those who believe in Christ and justly damns unbelievers, John 3, 18; 6, 40; Mark 16, 16. The antecedent will considers 1) the intention and counsel of God respecting our

* And on this point Missouri agrees with the Calvinists. The fact, that the decree of election pertains just to these persons and to none besides, they tell us, has nothing to do with their future appropriation of Christ's merit, but depends entirely on the "secret purpose of election", the arcanum libitum

salvation, and 2) the order of causes or means which are appointed for this purpose; to these belongs 1) the principal cause, God's universal love, John 3, 16; 2) the meritorious cause, Christ's universal merit, 1 John 2, 2; 3) the instrumental proffering cause, the universal vocation through the Gospel, Matt. 28, 19. The subsequent will considers the application of these means to men, as this takes place through the instrumental receptive cause, faith which comes by preaching (Rom. 10, 17). From this follows the particular election of those who believe, and its opposite, the result of neglect and contempt, the condemnation of unbelievers." (P. 459.)

We will not go beyond the time of the subscribers of the Formula of Concord. All the testimonies adduced above were published when, as can be demonstrated, many of the original subscribers were still living and active. We make room, in conclusion, for one more testimony, which is important since in its way it is to a certain degree official. In 1631, while a few of the F. C. men were still alive, the Leipzig Colloquium took place between Lutheran and Reformed theologians. On the Lutheran side there were Hoe von Hoenegg (b. 1580: Superintendent in Voigtland in 1603; Professor at Wittenberg in 1604), Heinrich Hoepfner (b. 1582; studied under G. Mylius; Professor at Leipzig since 1617), and Polycarp Leyser (the younger, a son of the older Polycarp L., b. 1586 at Wittenberg, Professor at Leipzig). Naturally one of the chief questions in the discussion was that of election, and especially the point concerning the foresight of faith, or concerning the election of believers as such.

The Reformed theologians (Bergius, Crocius, and Neuberger) declared: "God has elected from eternity in Jesus Christ from among the corrupt race of mankind not all, but some, whose number and names are known to Him alone, whom in His own time He will enlighten unto faith in Christ, through the power and operation of His Word and Spirit, renew and preserve therein till the end, and finally save through faith. That He found or foresaw no cause, or occasion, or antecedent means, or condition for such election in the elect themselves, neither their good works, nor their faith, nor even the first salutary inclination, motion, or consent unto faith, but that all the good that is in them proceeds originally only from the pure voluntary grace of God which is

ordained and given them from eternity in Christ in preference to others."

The following are the points in the counter-declaration on the part of the Lutheran theologians (Hoe von Hoenegg, Leyser, Hoepfner), pertaining to the present question: "That God has elected in Christ from eternity and before the foundation of the world not all, but some men unto eternal salvation. That God has elected from eternity those of whom He foresaw that in time they would believe in Christ through the power and operation of His Word and Spirit, and would abide in Him till their end. That in election God found no cause or occasion for such election in the elect themselves, not even a first inclination, motion, or consent unto faith, but that all that is good in the elect proceeds originally from the pure and voluntary grace of God, which is given them in Christ Jesus from eternity. Besides all this the theologians of the Electorate of Saxony declare that they continue to consider everything that is taught in the Book of Concord concerning this article of predestination correct and in harmony with the Scriptures. And especially that God indeed elected us through grace in Christ, but in such a way that He foresaw who would perseveringly and truly believe in Christ; and those of whom He foresaw that they would so believe, He also ordained and elected unto salvation and glory." (Cf. the work of Prof. F. W. Stellhorn in the present volume, p. 27, etc.—R. C. H. Lenski.)

PART II.

DID OUR LUTHERAN FATHERS DEPART FROM THE CONFESSION BY TEACHING, THAT THE ELECTION OF CERTAIN PERSONS TOOK PLACE IN VIEW OF FAITH?

1.

We have made our Lutheran Fathers, albeit only those of the period of the Formula of Concord and the time immediately following, render their explicit testimony relative to the question, whether the final election to salvation takes place with or without regard to the appropriation of the merits of Christ through faith. We should be able to advance a long series of excellent, edifying and instructive testimonies of the later teachers of our Church, but we see ourselves constrained to break off here and proceed to the second chief question.

We have formulated the question on purpose in its historic aspect. When the original defenders and signers of the Formula of Concord were living, they were recognized as the representatives of the Church, and as such they defended the Confessions of the Church against the Calvinists and Huberians. It is an indisputable fact, established beyond all doubt, that Lutheran theology, through these representatives, universally, publicly and freely, took its stand upon the doctrine, that the particular election of certain sinners to salvation, to the exclusion of others, depended upon the merits of Christ as apprehended by faith. The connecting link between faith on the part of the sinner and election on the part of God is the foreknowledge of the latter, according to which God has made His selection in this world of sinners for eternal life. In consequence of the Moempelgart colloquy between Jacob Andreæ and Beza the attention of the Lutherans as well as the Reformed was drawn more than ever to the doctrine of predestination. It is undeniable, that hitherto this article had not been guarded on all sides against false and misleading expressions and statements. The most zealous Lutherans of the time before the Formula

of Concord adopted theses in plain contradiction to the Word of God. Even Missouri, which formerly boasted of having merely retraced its steps to the older form of teaching, as regards predestination, and without reservation confessed its adherence to the doctrine of election as formulated by those theologians,* now commences to make surprising concessions in this respect. The very adoption of the Formula of Concord, but still more the controversies conducted in connection with the same, united the Lutheran Church completely in an orthodox conception of the doctrine of election, especially in its relation to the gracious will of God which embraces all men without distinction, which is the same for all men from beginning to end, and does not, as far as the final decree to salvation is concerned, demand faith in some and not in others. Between Lutheranism and Calvinism an ever widening breach manifests itself in their respective attitude toward this article of faith, a wall of separation becoming distinct and strong in proportion as the principles involved are understood. Other articles, for instance that of the Lord's Supper, were relatively placed into the background and the doctrine of predestination became the principal point of controversy and the general cynosure. Soon that part of the doctrine of election which treats of the relation of faith to the elective decree (intuitu fidei, in view of faith), became the center of the fiercest contention. The Lutherans contended: Yes, God has had faith in view, in the election which took

* We read, for instance, in the Minutes of the Northern District of the Missouri Synod of the year '86, the following statement: "It is a gross misunderstanding of the moderns who charge Luther, Heshusius, Flacius, Wigand, and others with Calvinism." According to this, Hunnius is falsely accused of Calvinism, though he teaches an unconditional reprobation side by side with an absolute election. Very frequently he says, especially in his writings against the synergists, that God has passed by the others (the non-elect) with His grace. In his "Theological Definitions" he gives the following description of election or predestination: "It is the eternal counsel of God, by which, before the foundation of the world, without regard to merits or works, solely out of His immeasurable grace, He has elected unto Himself, in His Son Jesus, a certain number of men, concerning whom He, according to the pleasure of His will, had determined, to call them by the preaching of the Gospel and to lead them through faith to eternal salvation and glory; and decreed, to leave the remaining multitudes in perdition." And that is not to be Calvinism! Alas, that Heshusius does not stand alone at that time with his consistent doctrine of election. But let them rest, the dead!

place in Christ; the Reformed said: No, God has not had anything in view but the pleasure of His will when He elected just those and no others to salvation. The Reformed with great zeal assailed the position of faith in election, claiming that this was covert Pelagianism, while the latter defended the position of faith as the central and germinal point of the doctrine of election in distinction from the Calvinistic system with its absolutism.

Twelve years after the adoption of the Formula of Concord the Huberian controversy arose. In his excessive zeal against Beza and the Calvinists Huber set forth the doctrine of the universality of election as well as of grace. Of a divine decree of election which concerns believers alone, and is, therefore, a particularizing act of God, he wanted to know nothing.* Then the whole Church which confessed her adherence to the Formula of Concord, arose as one man and gave her testimony decidedly and unanimously. In Saxony, in Wuertemberg, in Prussia, in Brandenburg, in short in all places in the Lutheran Church the original authors and signers of the Formula of Concord arise and say: Election to salvation in as far as it infallibly predestinates persons to eternal life, covers the children of God or the believers in Christ and has regard (consideratio, respectus) to the appropriation and retention of the merits of Christ. The devil — much less a St. Louis sophist — cannot in the least change this mighty historic fact. At a time, when far and wide, the original signers of the Formula of Concord are standing guard by the thousand, the doctrine of election "in view of faith" is recognized publicly and universally as the genuine doctrine of the Holy Scriptures and the Confessions. The Calvinists, to be sure, animadverted against it also after this. But among the Lutherans, if we except the Huberians, there is the utmost unanimity of interpretation of the Scriptures as well as of the Confessions. Were it necessary to corroborate this by testimony of our own time, we need only to appeal to the silence of the St. Louis people, as profound as the grave. For a year past they have viewed with suppressed rage the testimonies of the Church and time of the Formula of Con-

* We, the opponents of Missouri, are the very persons who, with the opponents of Huber, denied the election of believers as such, and this as relentlessly against Huber's false universalism as against the particularism of Calvinists and Missourians; and yet Missourians have accused us of being disciples of Huber!

cord, which we have been publishing, but can not say a word against them, for otherwise they would not have failed to do so. "No answer" is, in this instance, a very plain and decisive answer.

Since we, "the opponents," intend only to defend the doctrine of the Formula of Concord against Missouri, we prefer to give our second question a purely historic aspect. Our doctrine is not new, and no recourse needs to be had to specious reasoning. To this Missouri itself testifies, as often as it accuses us of blindly following the fathers in the matter as well as in the arguments employed, instead of following the Holy Scriptures. If Missouri should contend, that we do not agree with the fathers in the doctrine of conversion, we answer: In the first place this is not true, but a misapprehension of the St. Louis people, as are many others of their asseverations; in the second place Missouri itself teaches, that there is no need of harmonizing the various articles of faith. What necessity, therefore, of dragging the teaching of the fathers concerning conversion, into the discussion regarding their teaching concerning predestination. We have not made it our object, for the present, to vindicate against Missourian perversion the doctrine of conversion held by the fathers, but their doctrine of election. The latter has been the subject in question from the beginning, and according to Missourian principles that is quite a different thing, quite a different article of faith from that of conversion. If there is no need, as the Missourians contend, of the doctrine of election being in agreement with that of the universality of divine grace, why do they emphasize the necessity of an agreement of the doctrine of election with that of conversion and the human will. If, therefore, our doctrine of election should contain elements contradictory to the accepted doctrine of conversion, it is not for Missouri to chide us for inconsistency, inasmuch as it seems to think that all articles of faith bear the stamp of divine truth and origin clearly in proportion to their disagreement with each other.

It is not a matter of indifference to us, whether our fathers have erred and deceived in this matter, or not. The doctrinal question which concerns us, is no open question, nor is it of a subordinate character, but a mighty question excelling and vitally influencing many others: Whether God has sealed and guaranteed to particular sinners as such or to particular believers as such eternal life, through their election. To conceive a Lutheran or

orthodox church which has conducted a wrong warfare against Calvinists, already at the time of the Formula of Concord, and has continued it to this moment with unanimity — neither proposing a correct thesis, nor rejecting the corresponding antithesis; neither giving a correct interpretation of the Holy Scriptures with reference to this article, nor properly understanding her own Confession of Faith; moreover obscuring and perverting the analogy of faith from this point — in short an orthodox church which has exceedingly erred and deceived, is a demand too monstrous to meet with compliance from us. Missouri will be compelled to produce other and better proofs than in the past to give the very least plausibility to the contention, that the fathers have been deceived and deceiving in this matter, and that the true light has not arisen till now, namely in St. Louis, so that not only Dr. Walther as self-constituted reformer of the first magnitude but also the minor reformers outshine, and place in the shade with their lustre, the whole theology maintained in the Lutheran Church since the time of the Formula of Concord. No, we are not ready to admit that the great warfare of our Church against Calvinsim has been, with respect to a whole series of fundamental articles, not only abortive but even heretical, since, according to Missouri, the Calvinists have been compelled to defend divine truth in this respect, while our Lutheran fathers have rejected and in a determined way assailed it, resisting conviction in spite of all cogent and conclusive arguments from the Holy Scriptures.

The claim, that the Lutheran theologians of the time of the Formula of Concord, have departed from the Confession in the essential particular of the eternal election of the children of God, involves a gross calumny. This is the case not because we impute inerrancy of the fathers, or freedom from error to all their statements, but because such a claim is tantamount to a charge of insincerity. For the assumption, that the original signers of the Formula of Concord, who have been adduced as witnesses, misunderstood the Confession of the Church, asks us to believe an impossibility. They lived in the very midst of the Church and knew what faith was held, confessed and propagated by the Church of their time. If they had made use of the Formula of Concord merely as a mask for their heretical doctrine, for the purpose of hiding their apostasy from the tenets of the Church under the authority of the Confession, what a terrible,

infamous deed this would have been! In the eyes of Missouri such an act may not seem so terrible, but that does not change the truth. It is and remains a calumniation of those godly men of the time of the Formula of Concord, to impute to them a departure from the Confession by their "Intuitu Fidei theory," and a desire to hypocritically protect their new doctrine by the authority of the Formula of Concord which they themselves had subscribed and introduced into the Church. O, what vengeance those old, honest champions of the truth would take upon their degenerate sons for such contempt, if the lists were not closed to the sainted dead!

If we dealt with opponents who did not hold membership in the Lutheran Church and lay claim to the Lutheran name, it would behoove us to defend the scriptural, and not the confessional, side of the doctrine of the fathers. The same condition would obtain, if the erring conscience of opponents needed aid. Neither is the case. Missouri purports to be the very flower of Lutheranism and also to have the sole right to the name. The question is, therefore, pertinent: Since when has your doctrine of predestination possessed citizen rights in our Church? Say you, Since 1580? Very well, let us examine the existing records; let us ask history: Which is the Lutheran doctrine and which is not? You can not deny, that at least since three centuries, since 1580, the doctrine of election "in view of faith" has been accepted among friends and foes as Lutheran in distinction from the Calvinistic doctrine. The question is: "Does the Confession contain another, a different doctrine?" Have our Lutheran fathers since 1580 really without exception departed, as far as this doctrine is concerned, from the Confession of the Church? Or are not really you the innovators who have departed from the doctrine of election, as transmitted to us, and, by implication, from the Scriptures and the fathers? We venture, therefore, to answer this question, whether the fathers, in the doctrine of election, have departed from the Confession of the Lutheran faith. By that we vindicate, in the first place, our fathers, against your audacious, shameless insult flung in the face especially of the original signers of the Formula of Concord and its defenders. At the same time we vindicate ourselves and our doctrine of election, of which you say, that we had learned it only of the fathers, and sustained it only by appeals to them. To advance from the Scriptures more and better proof we deem,

in the present state of affairs, as superfluous as to furnish new proof of the scripturalness of the Lutheran doctrine of the Holy Supper over against the Calvinists, or of the Lutheran doctrine of justification over against the Romanists. You know the Lutheran arguments as well as we do, but you are not willing to accept them, therefore there is no help for you. But as long as you demand recognition of your claim to membership in our Lutheran Church, your claim shall be disputed as relentlessly as that of other renegades who are Lutheran only in name, but not in the historic acceptation of that term. Energetic protests must be raised: the enemy who has crept into the stronghold by stealth must be ejected. If you desire to found a new church entitled, perhaps, "Church of the Reformation" or still better "Church of Missouri," and to vindicate your doctrines by appeals to Scripture, as other heretical bodies do, we can not prevent it. But we shall not let you creep into the fortress of our Lutheran Confession and settle down in it with your typically and essentially Calvinistic doctrine. The fort is ours, because the Confession, as solemnly received in 1580 by our Church, and honored ever since, does not contain your doctrine of the selection of particular sinners as such, for the bestowal of eternal life. It teaches, on the contrary, the doctrine, hitherto recognized as specifically Lutheran, of the election of believers in Christ as such, or of election with regard to the future apprehension of the merits of Christ.

It behooves us, therefore, to investigate, whether the original signers of the Formula of Concord (and with them the whole later Church of the Lutheran faith) have, in the fundamental article of the election of the children of God to eternal life, departed from the Confession of the Church, as you Missourians falsely aver, or whether the Church has abided by her Confession, and you are the Calvinistic innovators, unfortunately behind the mask of our Lutheran Confession.

II.

Does Missouri really contend that our fathers have departed from the Lutheran Confession with their doctrine of "election to salvation in view of faith"? Is not the difficulty chiefly in the mode of expression, in the use of technical terms, while all sides recognize, that the doctrinal substance, though clothed in defective and fallacious expression, is entirely orthodox and

in perfect agreement with the Scriptures as well as with the Confessions? The substance of a doctrine and its expression are two things vastly different. Undoubtedly both should be correct, if perfection could always be attained in this mundane sphere. But when it occurs that faithful, pious teachers of the Church clothe a scriptural orthodox doctrine in a form which is inadequate and liable to misinterpretation and abuse, it surely must be permissible, to draw attention to such infelicitous terminology, and to remove the evil by proper attempts at correction. Whoever makes that the object of his effort, does not produce any alteration in the substance of the doctrine and cannot be accused of rejecting the substance of the doctrine of teachers admittedly orthodox, since he objects only to their defective mode of expression.

What, therefore, is the nature of the issue between Missouri and our fathers who have taught the Church since the time of the Formula of Concord? We should think that this question answers itself to the satisfaction of any one who has heard anything at all about the two respective doctrines. The whole world knows that for centuries a warfare has been waged between our fathers and the Calvinists in regard to predestination, the latter contending that God has elected from the whole multitude of sinners particular persons according to an absolute secret purpose and the mere pleasure of His will; the former claiming that this election has taken place according to the counsels of His grace, as revealed in the Gospel, namely according to His foreknowledge of the future faith in Jesus Christ. This was the chief and central question between Lutheranism and Calvinism, in the doctrine of the election of persons to eternal life. John Musæus writes: "As regards the doctrine of election, our Lutheran theologians agree with the greatest unanimity, and teach over against Calvinists, that the decree of election is not absolute. On the contrary, as we are saved during the time of our life by faith (fide, per fidem, ex fide) even so God has elected and ordained to eternal life from eternity 'intuitu praevisae fidei' in view of foreseen faith, all those who are justified during their lifetime. In this, I say, all true theologians on our side are agreed." (Hist. Syncr., p. 1041.) What Musæus maintains here as to the unanimity among our Lutheran theologians we find corroborated in the most splendid manner, when we compare the writings of our fathers against Huber and against the Calvinists; and also their

postils, doctrinal books, works of edification, commentaries, dissertations on the symbols and other writings. There can be no doubt as to the meaning of our Lutheran theologians, whatever difference may exist in their mode of expression. It is always apparent that they understand by the objects of election, not sinners as such, ordained to eternal life according to the secret pleasure of God's will, but they teach in decided opposition to such Calvinistic theory of predestination, that foreseen believers have been ordained to eternal life in Jesus Christ, according to the revealed pleasure of the Father's will. Now comes Missouri and says:

"It is false doctrine, that God, in His decree of election, has had regard to faith and that He has set apart and elected from the whole multitude of the lost, in view of their foreseen faith, the particular persons who are infallibly to be saved. This election, on the contrary, has taken place among sinners in every respect in the same condition, according to the secret purpose and good pleasure of God, and is, therefore, a mystery which cannot be reconciled with the universal gracious will of God, according to which the final decree of salvation depends upon faith." While the universal gracious will of God says: "No sinner without faith can, as such, be ordained and elected to eternal life," the doctrine of predestination (according to Missouri) sets forth: "Yea, notwithstanding, certain persons are ordained both to eternal life, and to the means and conditions necessary to its apprehension; they are ordained as mere sinners, which are all alike." Whereas the universal gracious will of God decidedly says to all sinners without exception: "First repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus, then adoption, and the heritage or ordination to eternal life"; the Missourian predestination says: "First divine adoption, the heritage, and ordination to salvation and with that naturally the ordination unto all means and conditions necessary for the attainment of this salvation." The universal gracious will of God knows nothing of a particular decree of salvation respecting any sinner, without regard to the apprehension of the merits of Christ as such. But according to Calvinists and Missourians the election of grace is on the one hand the final decisive decree of salvation, on the other it is entirely independent of foreseen faith in Christ.

In short, while our Lutheran fathers answer the central question: Has election taken place in view of faith? by "yes", but

the Calvinists by "no", the Missourians side with the latter in answering "no". The contention is, that election to salvation does not cover those whose faith was foreseen, as such, but merely particular sinners as such in no way differing from others. There can be no greater difference between yes and no than between these views respectively, inasmuch as Calvinists and Missourians deny positively what our Lutheran theologians affirm and these affirm just as positively what Calvinists and Semi-Calvinists deny.

We should think now, that since Missouri has gone over to the enemy as regards this doctrine "intuitu fidei" and, in the use of arguments and counter-arguments, blows the same horn as the Calvinists, it should have confessed honestly and openly: Our Lutheran fathers, alas, as far as this one feature is concerned (which was considered by both parties as of vital importance), have rejected the pure doctrine of the Word of God and defended a doctrine opposed to the Scriptures and the Confessions. They have, alas, in this central point, which they themselves made the test of what was Lutheranism and what Calvinism, departed from the doctrine of the Church, and have introduced a doctrine of election into the Church which was entirely new, a doctrine which is stigmatized even in the Confessions as a doctrine "terrible, not to be tolerated in the Church of God." The glory, that our Church has maintained for the last three centuries, over against the Calvinists, nothing but the truth of God and of His Holy Word, we are constrained to surrender. Not the Lutherans, but the Calvinists believed, taught, confessed, and defended the truth of God, as regards the main question: Has God elected from the mass of sinners, sinners as such, to eternal salvation, according to the mere inexplicable pleasure of His will? Or has He, according to His pleasure, as revealed in the Gospel, elected and ordained in Jesus Christ, His Son, all those sinners, of whom He foresaw, that they would in true faith apprehend the only thing which avails before God, namely the merits of Christ? This fundamental difference in viewing the matter would make it appear that our Lutheran fathers rejected the truth of God, as expressed in the Confession and defended by the Calvinists, that they have run counter to the pure Gospel and defended a fundamental error.

Thus Missouri ought to have spoken in all honesty, as regards the doctrine, the very substance of the doctrine which our

theologians have endeavored to maintain and vindicate with their "intuitu fidei" over against the absolute election of the Calvinists. Missouri ought to have confessed in all honesty: Not the mode of expression or the terminology is the matter in question, but quite other things; for the detailed amplification and strenuous defense of their "intuitu fidei" render it quite evident, that our so-called orthodox fathers had views radically wrong about the doctrine of election, wherefore they also set up an entirely new theory embellished by Scripture proofs and argumentation. Therefore, henceforth away with the fathers. Sexagenarios de ponte!

If Dr. Walther had renounced his allegiance to the fathers at the time, when he dropped his "Samenkoerner" [seed] in fertile soil, thus preparing the way for the later general introduction of his predestination doctrine, who knows, what the situation would be to-day? But the cause that he advocated, did not lack the aid of shrewd diplomacy, even if it lacked the element of truth. For thirty years he had taken his stand upon the fathers against the Iowa Synod, against the General Synod, the Pennsylvanians, the Ohioans and others. At that time no one dared to question the orthodoxy of the fathers, while he, at that time, commended their writings and testimonies as interpretations of Scripture, as pure and true as gold. The intention was not, of course, to let the fathers supersede the Holy Scriptures, that much was understood, but the object was, to hear the old teachers as the voice of the Church, as often as a contention arose, as to what was Lutheran.* In 1852 Dr. Walther wrote in his preface of the work: "The Voice of our Church in the Question of Church and

* How times have changed! Since we, the opponents of Missouri, have endeavored to follow the lines formerly laid down by Missouri, by appealing to those fathers of the Church who are acknowledged to be orthodox teachers and authentic interpreters of the Confessions, Missouri has changed front, refusing to listen henceforth to our appeals to the fathers, denouncing their guidance as a heretical perversion of scriptural principle and a Romanizing tendency.

Dear Missouri, we know where the shoe pinches. You are entirely convinced of the historical fact, that the Church which in 1580 adopted the Formula of Concord also clearly and emphatically bequeathed to posterity her definition of election. This definition of election, as given by the primitive Church of the Formula of Concord, and her interpretation of Article XI are all but attacked and rejected by Missouri. For this reason sly Missouri must resort to the trick: "Scripture, only Scripture. Away with the fathers!" Hinc illae lacrymae.

Office": The peculiar circumstances, in which we are placed, and which subject us to the necessity of remaining behind the mother Church in her onward march, are not without a compensating blessing. These circumstances compel us more than other brethren, to renounce many of the blessings of modern research, and to take our seat so much more eagerly at the feet of the old teachers, to seek for treasures which our Church has won by so much labor and battle, and to keep the same with conscientious fidelity, even if we are not able to add anything to them. Therefore we judge, that in spite of our poverty in other respects, we are possessed of a talent with which we can and should work for our general welfare."

At a time, when such words were written about our old fathers, it would not have been expedient, to write upon one's banner: "Scripture, Scripture," and to make front against the opponents who held aloft, to one's vexation and discomfiture, the testimony of the fathers, for instance concerning predestination, by shouting: "What fathers, fathers? Do not come with your fathers. Are we papists, that you want to come with your old teachers and perplex us with their testimonies as the alleged voice of the Church?" O no, at that time there was use for the fathers; therefore they were honored and their labors were thoroughly utilized. Where the simple historic question was under discussion: What is Calvinistic, what is papistic, what is Lutheran, the fathers were rightfully permitted to speak the decisive word. For what is and what is not Lutheran (historically considered), cannot be determined by methods of scriptural interpretation, but by historical research. Therefore, if the meaning of the Lutheran Confession is called into question by two doctrines purporting to be Lutheran, though antagonizing each other like fire and water, it stands to reason, that besides the words of the Confession itself, also the testimonies of our old teachers, especially of the original authors, signers, and defenders of each symbol are emphatically entitled to consideration and that every thoughtful man will permit them to decide for him, what is the genuine sense of a symbol as an ecclesiastic, historical document.

Very interesting and instructive is the manner in which Missouri has settled with the fathers in the predestination controversy. At first it felt that it could not afford to break with the fathers as regards this doctrine, lest it should forfeit its whole position in history and its respectful attitude towards the fathers.

In the year 1868 the writer found, for the first time, occasion to take up weapons for the "intuitu fidei." On page 24 of the Minutes of the Northern District of the year mentioned we read: "The question, Why is it Pelagianism to consider faith as a medium, as long as the cause of election is ascribed not to faith in itself but to Christ as apprehended by faith? was answered: By that a condition would be prescribed to God. Faith is a connecting link; but if you teach, that God has elected to salvation in view of faith, faith is considered not as a connecting link, but as a condition. You may make your distinctions ever so subtle, still a certain causality is ascribed to faith."

These declarations perplexed us greatly at the time, but we had no idea what sort of "seed" was thus being scattered abroad.

In the year 1872 Prof. Fritschel attacked us Missourians on account of these utterances. He wrote in Brobst's "Monatsheften" in January as follows:

"The doctrine of the old dogmaticians, that God has elected to eternal life those whose faith He has foreseen, is assailed by the Missouri Synod as Pelagianism, on the assumption that this doctrine, in a manner, however subtle, ascribes a cause of eternal salvation to man, and not every thing to the free grace of God." He affirmed further, that this arraignment of the pure Lutheran doctrine by putting it upon the same level with the false Arminian and Pelagian doctrine, was a rude insult to the Lutheran Church, and it would be a disgrace for the Missouri Synod that could never be extinguished, if earnest protests were not raised against these aspersions upon our old dogmaticians, etc.

What did Dr. Walther answer? Did he say, perhaps: "Go to with your fathers. Now God is about to reform His Lutheran Church in spite of the fathers; who tells you to cry with Dr. Eck, 'Fathers, fathers'? The good fathers have erred in this doctrine, they have departed from Scripture and Symbol, and we Missourians are the people who are to establish order in this article of our doctrine."

O no, that would have been too hazardous a game at that time. Therefore Dr. Walther did not, at that time, attack the doctrine of the fathers as Pelagianism. On the contrary, the Synod declared its adherence to that doctrine, as the following quotation shows: "There is a great difference between the expression: 'God has elected those of whom He foresaw, that they

would persevere in the faith' and the other: 'on account of their faith.' The former is perfectly correct according to Rom. 8, 29, the latter is Pelagianism. Also the axiom 'not on account of but through faith are we elected to salvation,' has met with approval. Our Synod, therefore, declares most emphatically, that the theologians of the seventeenth century have also set forth the correct doctrine of predestination and maintained it against the Calvinists; only one exception it takes to the presentation of this doctrine; the expression 'intuitu fidei' is an infelicitous term. Not the doctrine, but the terminology of the dogmaticians have we, in one single point, rejected as inappropriate." (Cf. Lehre und Wehre 1872, p. 128, etc.)

The doctrine itself, the doctrinal substance and matter was, accordingly, declared to be perfectly correct, as pure as gold, and entirely in harmony with the Scriptures as well as with the Symbol. Only the mode of expression, the terminology, was infelicitous. But what our fathers meant by this expression "intuitu fidei," what they believed and defended as truth by this expression, was an orthodox sense which they connected with an infelicitous term. This sense Missouri at that time purported to hold fast as entirely correct, "and as clearly based upon the Word of God (Rom. 8, 29)," and declared its willingness to defend it against the Calvinists. But not only then, when the same doctrine was said to have been believed in the heart of the Synod, was this distinction made between the doctrine taught by the fathers and their defective expression, but even after the beginning of the controversy, Dr. Walther wrote: "The doctrine of Luther and Chemnitz, as it is laid down in the Formula of Concord, we desire to hold fast and hold it fast indeed. . . . We are far from imputing to the later dogmaticians a false doctrine of predestination (Lehre und Wehre, '80-67, 68.) They were far from trying to correct the pure biblical and symbolical doctrine by that doubtful expression 'intuitu fidei.' On the contrary, they hold fast to it in all sincerity. . . . Therefore it would be heresy hunting pure and simple, to denounce as false teachers those theologians whose merits in developing and defending the doctrine of our Church are unquestionable, on account of that expression which, it is true, is liable to be misunderstood." (Page 98.)

Such were formerly their utterances, although at the same time the real theses of the fathers, their proofs from Scripture

and their arguments against the Calvinists (albeit without the mentioning of names) were taken up and denounced as heretical. But later their courage rose and bolder attempts were made to get rid of the fathers, even going so far as to say: "What do the fathers concern us?" In 1882 Prof. Stoeckhardt wrote already in L. u. W., p. 158:

"It is beyond all doubt that the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century in some manner, however indefinite, make election depend upon faith. When they make the 'intuitu fidei' their shibboleth; when they understand the phrase, that God has elected those whose faith He has foreseen, in the same sense; when they bring out the so-called 'syllabus praedestinarius,'* according to which election results from the universal gracious will and the foreknowledge of faith: they thereby declare the dependence of election upon faith. They seek to explain the wonderful mystery of the discretio personarum (of the separation of persons) and to make it plausible to reason. And herein they have departed from Scripture and Symbol and have erred. Herein we do not agree with them.

On a more recent occasion a sort of official declaration has been made. The Faculty of the Philadelphia Seminary declared in an Opinion on predestination: "But when those expressions (intuitu fidei and others) which at one time were used by our most trusted theologians, are now condemned, as though they were in conflict with the Confession either in themselves or in the amplification which they received at the hands of the dogmaticians . . . we are constrained . . . to regard this as a misunderstanding of the historic standpoint of the Formula of Concord."

Thereupon replies L. u. W., as an answer from the faculty and editor, not as a private opinion of Prof. Pieper: "The later theologians find in the same passages of Scripture the intuitu fidei; they especially understand the οὕς προέγνω† in Rom. 8, 29, not as synonymous with the 'elect,' but interpret the passage to mean, 'whose faith He has foreseen' (which was right as late as '72 according to the judgment of the Synod). Upon this interpretation they not only base their whole doctrine of election as deter-

* I. e. the following three propositions joined in logical form: 1. The decree, to save all those who persevere in faith. 2. The foreknowledge who those believers are. 3. The decree of particular election, to save these persons in distinction from the others.

† Whom He has foreknown.

mined by the intuitu fidei, but they combat the interpretation of the Formula of Concord as Calvinistic (!!) Here we are placed before an unavoidable alternative. We are compelled to drop either the later dogmaticians or the Confession. The prohibition involved in the above Opinion, that we dare not assume a conflict between the Confession and the later theologians, does not help us surmount the difficulty. Nor can the objection be countenanced that the matter in question is a difference of exegetical interpretation. The difference ceases to be of a merely exegetical character, when the 'sedes doctrinæ' involved are accorded different interpretations. It is impossible, for instance, that two should agree in the doctrine of justification as long as they accord the 'sedes doctrinae' involved totally different interpretations. Precisely this is the issue between the 'intuitu fidei' theologians and the Formula of Concord. The 'intuitu fidei' gives the doctrine of predestination a unique form, and in so far as the later theologians endeavor to give currency to this term and base their doctrine upon it, they are in conflict with the Formula of Concord; but the same theologians do not conflict with the Formula of Concord whenever they break through the ban of the 'intuitu fidei.' In formulating the doctrine of predestination, it is necessary to side either with the Formula of Concord or with the later theologians. The later theologians do not, as a rule, trouble themselves much about the Formula of Concord; what the Formula of Concord says will not fit in with their theory." (July number, p. 245.)

Now, what answer does Missouri give to the question, whether the later theologians have departed from the Formula of Concord? The answer depends upon circumstances. Missouri is shrewd and can answer now "yes," now "no," according to the contingencies of the situation. Is the trend of the question: "How can you insult our Church in this fashion, and how dare you accuse our old fathers of false doctrine and apostasy from the Confession?" Missouri simulates indignant rage and scowls and fumes: "Who imputes to these worthy men false doctrine? Surely not we Missourians." But if the question is: "Well, if the sense so often and clearly set forth by the fathers through the expression intuitu fidei, is correct, the phrase also is likely to comport with both Scripture and Symbol and to be in harmony with the Confession,"—then Missouri turns away from the fathers.

and contends that their doctrine in its real form is in contradiction to Scripture and Symbol. Now "yes," now "no" may be a shrewd expedient, but is it wisdom?

III.

There was a time, when even Missouri hesitated to declare the doctrine of the so-called later dogmaticians false and opposed to Scripture and Symbol. The mere reproach, that this had been done and that an insult had thus been flung in the face of our Church, provoked no little rage in its camp in '72. Incensed and indignant in the highest degree on account of this grievous charge, it made the allegation (and who would at that time not gladly have believed it to be true), that not the doctrine, not the real opinion, not the matter of the faith of our Lutheran theologians was called in question, but that exception was merely taken to the clothing of this doctrine in a form not only infelicitous, but even fallacious, so that their words really express something widely different from the intended sense. And this was said not concerning the earlier dogmaticians, but especially concerning Hollazius, who is well known as one of the later dogmaticians.

Is a misunderstanding possible here? Is it conceivable that Missouri, at that time already, consciously, uncompromisingly and clearly held to its present doctrine of predestination, and was only so unfortunate as to misunderstand our dogmaticians so completely as to impute to them the very doctrine which they combated relentlessly and rejected as a Calvinistic error? A misunderstanding, alas, was impossible. The matter was as plain as the light of day. The issue in the great predestination controversy between Lutherans and Calvinists was the fundamental question, whether the final choice of sinners to salvation out of the mass of sinners had been made according to a secret purpose, or according to a plan revealed in the gospel and embracing the faithful as foreknown from eternity. The Calvinists contended for the former view and applied their principle in earnest by harmonizing their whole doctrine with their particularism both as to the position and force given it in their presentation of the way of salvation. The Lutherans contended for the opposite view and permitted the evangelical doctrine of salvation to stand unabridged, unobscured without a particle of its power being neutralized. Our Lutheran theologians of

that time did not dream of an impossible chasm, of an insoluble contradiction between the universal will of divine grace, between the universal counsel of election, and the particular elective decree, in short between the gospel for poor sinners and the article of predestination. On the contrary, they could not emphasize sufficiently that the gospel of Jesus Christ is, at the same time, the revelation of eternal predestination, thus bringing into exquisite harmony the pure doctrine of the final separation unto eternal life of all persevering believers, with the revealed gospel, and confirming most positively the truth of universal grace. This position they took of necessity, if they desired to maintain that the election to eternal life had as its objects not men who irrespective of faith were considered as being in the same state of sin and condemnation with the mass of mankind, but, on the contrary, men who by faith had apprehended the merits of Christ. They let the law of cause and effect stand, but they reversed its operation from the standpoint of Calvinism. If our Lutheran fathers had believed with Calvin and Missouri that God by His elective will had ordained to eternal life sinners from the multitude of their companions in the same condition; and on the strength of this election to salvation, as the end, had foreordained them also to faith, as the means, they would have been constrained with Calvin to demonstrate away the existence of universal grace, or with Missouri to contend for an impossible chasm between the two. This much is certain, that the doctrine of the fathers in this central point is unmistakable. Every man, who only cursorily considers the difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism, finds, as is exemplified in hundreds of writings, that the Calvinstic conception of the setting apart of certain sinners as such is combated by our Lutheran theologians as a fundamental error, whereas an election of believers in Christ as such is most emphatically taught and vindicated by them by argument from Scripture and Symbol.

When Missouri still frankly and freely admitted that the doctrine of the fathers was scriptural and orthodox, even though their mode of expression was, at least in part, infelicitous, this concession was made because it was instinctively felt to be a matter of far reaching consequence to charge the fathers with a deviation from Scripture and Symbol in the article of predestination. What would become of the historical orthodox Lutheran Church, if, in this central point, error, yea heresy, had been entertained and defended against the Calvinists. In this

case both Churches would have been heterodox, albeit the one a little less, the other a little more, inasmuch as Calvinists had cast overboard the universal counsel of grace and the Lutherans the particular elective decree instead of maintaining both in unrhymed disharmony. Where the Lutherans were orthodox, the Calvinists were wrong, but where these were right (election from the mass of sinners unto glory and the means thereto) the Lutherans were manifestly wrong (election of believers as such, in foreknowledge of the apprehended merits of Christ). And to admit openly that our Lutheran Church, at least since Gerhard (1615), has been a church apostate, without fidelity to Scripture and Confession, yea has developed a wrong conception of election and defended the same, in spite of all conclusive scriptural proofs — such things Missouri could not and would not admit, nor could she afford to do this without breaking with all historical Lutheranism as the palladium of evangelical orthodoxy. Recourse was therefore had to the subterfuge that the doctrine of the fathers (that God elected those whose faith He foresaw) was entirely correct according to Rom. 8, 29, and needed to be emphasized and defended against the Calvinists to this day. The question under discussion was admitted to be the subordinate one, whether the fathers had always chosen the best phraseology, the correct and most fitting mode of expression. Thanks to Missouri to-day yet for this most important concession! "Out of thine own mouth thou shalt be judged." Thou mayest boast of thy proud reformatory achievements, and with a contemptuous side glance at our dear fathers charge them as "Intuitu fidei theologians" with departure from Scripture and Symbol, with a doctrine wholly influenced by the "intuitu fidei," so that its antagonism to Scripture and Symbol, resulting from its novel form, compelled one to go either to the right or to the left — thy testimony which did praise the fathers as true and faithful to the Scriptures and the Confessions, especially also in this point, now condemns thee in the eyes of all fair minded men and will condemn thee even more relentlessly at the throne of the Judge of the world. But in this historical question we are concerned not so much with the honor of the later Lutheran Theology and Church, although also from this point of view the question is of the utmost importance for every Lutheran to whom his Church is dear. The chief question is: When has there been a Lutheran Theology and Church that had not

understood the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord essentially in the same manner as the so-called later dogmaticians? Where are we to seek the Lutheran Church and school of theology that has accepted the Formula of Concord in the Missourian sense? When and where has there been such a Lutheran Church? In Saxony, or in Mecklenburg, in Brunswick, Wuertemberg, Hessia, Brandenburg? Or was such a definition of elective grace propounded at one of the universities, perhaps Wittenberg, or Leipsic, or Jena, at the time when the original signers of the Formula of Concord one after the other interpreted and defended the Lutheran doctrine of election both against the Calvinists and against Huber according to Scripture and Symbol?

The "correct understanding" of a Symbol of the Church is surely a queer thing, if the very Church and theology which has examined the Symbol on all sides with the greatest thoroughness, has balanced it according to thesis and antithesis, and has accepted it with universal gladness, should have had no idea of the correct interpretation of the same and even combated the right interpretation as false doctrine through numerous utterances of her leaders. What a queer phenomenon! What sort of a Church, what sort of theologians were they who professed adherence to the eleventh article without comprehending in the least its most fundamental thought — yea who rejected the definition of election alleged to be contained in the Confession and defended with the utmost vigor — a definition branded in the Confession itself as horrible? How do we feel, when we try to picture to ourselves this marvelous condition of things according to the contention of Missouri? What insult to our Church! What calumniation of her good name! It is possible that Missouri with her present strong appeals to Scripture has intentions, as yet, not revealed. Perhaps we behold here for a second time a judicious planting of "grains of seed," in order to secure, in time to come, should necessity arise, riddance from the Confession altogether as nothing but "human doctrine." Missouri's practice in the past with its "grains of seed" does not render this impossible. At all events we dare not trust these much lauded "grains of seed." The situation has finally become very precarious for the Missourian standpoint by reason of the testimony of the fathers adduced en masse. Facts are stubborn things! They cannot be gotten rid of by silence, nor by demonstrations,

nor by sophistry — what remains to be done? If only these original signers of the Formula of Concord had kept to themselves their interpretation of the scriptural and symbolical doctrine of election so that only from the time of Gerhard on (about thirty years after the acceptance of the Formula of Concord) the Lutheran dogmaticians would have rendered themselves open to the charge of departure from the Symbol. Then there would be, at least, a show of defence. But, the whole army of the original authors, signers and representatives of the Symbol arise and say as one man: Thus and not otherwise the eleventh article is to be understood; this and nothing else is the faith, doctrine and confession of the Lutheran Church in this article over against Calvin and Huber, Pelagius and pope. Let us read their testimonies and compare them with what Missouri purports to find in the Confession! With one voice they all say from North to South, from East to West: Particular election as taught in the Formula of Concord is to be conceived as having for its objects believers as such, not "certain persons" or "certain sinners" singled out from the human millions — all alike languishing in the same ruin. This item was discussed repeatedly at the time of the composition and acceptance of the Formula of Concord, partly on account of the Calvinists, partly on account of the Huberians before Huber who in their opposition to the unconditional election of the Calvinists left the golden mean and advocated a universal election theory.

As a case in point, we find Jacob Andreæ, (together with Chemnitz, the chief author of the Formula of Concord) writing to the elector of Saxony in 1577 already, at the time when the discussions concerning the Symbol were still in progress: "That God has elected all men to eternal life, is not true. For though God wills, honestly, that all men should be saved, the election of grace embraces only those who repent and believe, as these theologians have written in a correct and Christian manner and always in harmony with the "Proceedings at Torgau." Accordingly the election of grace embraces not all sinners and ungodly men, nor some men considered only as sinners and ungodly in common with other men, but those who repent and believe. And that is taught by the Proceedings at Torgau, meaning the Formula of Concord. There it is written, to be sure, that God has determined, from eternity, that He would receive into His grace, unto adoption and the inheritance of eternal life all

those who would repent and believe, and that He would save no one outside of those who acknowledge His Son.

This testimony is strengthened by a statement of Nik. Selnecker in his record of the discussions on the occasion of the composition of the Formula of Concord. He writes: Some one said that predestination is universal, as far as its cause is concerned, namely the will of God. Answer: Though God wills, that all men should be converted and saved, predestination and the definite promise is confined to those who believe the Word, and embraces those who according to the established order of God repent of their sins and truly believe in Christ. This is shown by the modification of the universal promises, for instance: "That he may turn from his wickedness, etc." "And whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, etc."

Here it is explicitly testified by Selnecker that he and the other authors of the Formula of Concord have understood and defined particular election, to which the eleventh article refers, not as a singling out of certain sinners as such, but of the penitent and believers as such. Who, now, is right, as far as the genuine understanding of the Symbol is concerned? Those authors of the Formula of Concord, whose clear utterances have been recorded above — or the Missouri of modern reformatory tendencies which claims to have discovered the genuine sense of the Formula of Concord after exactly three hundred years?

In the year 1586, the famous colloquy of Moempelgart took place between Beza and Andreæ. Beza was at that time beyond question the most prominent defender of Calvinistic predestinarianism. Andreæ was second only to Chemnitz, who died two weeks later, in the respect and following which he commanded in the Lutheran Church. Being one of the authors of the Formula of Concord he was the real editor of it in its final form. A decisive battle was fought at this colloquy which was of the greatest moment for all future time. After that colloquy the predestination question became the cynosure of Calvinists and Lutherans. Not only orally was this doctrine discussed, but toward the conclusion written theses were also exchanged, to which the opposing party affixed comments. In the nature of the case the seriousness of the call of grace, the universality of redemption and the efficacy of the call of grace constituted the gist of the discussions. But also the respective dif-

ferences in the definition of election became manifest with sufficient clearness, especially in the theses of Andreæ written at home at leisure and with due deliberation in answer to the theses of Beza, also submitted in writing. Andreæ says here: "God has not willed absolutely, that all men should be saved, for then all men would surely be saved. For who would resist His will? But He has willed the salvation of the race with a will restricted and qualified by the personal relation of the sinner to Christ. (Restricta voluntate in Christo.) Outside of this will no salvation is intended and offered, but this will is proclaimed to all men through the preaching of the Gospel and the use of the Holy Sacraments. Whoever opposes himself to this will is lost not through the will of God, but through his own ungodliness." Furthermore: "Election is not defined as an absolute decree of God but as a decree in Christ, in accordance with which all men are called to repentance. Therefore no one should exclude himself from the number of the elect, but speak with Augustine: "If thou art not predestinated, do thy part in order to be predestined." The following is of special importance: Beza had laid down the thesis: "It is equally false, that unbelief is the cause of the divine decree of the just condemnation of some, and that foreseen faith and good works are a cause of the predestination of the elect, which is Pelagianism." How did Beza happen to brand the doctrine as Pelagianism that foreseen faith is a cause of election? Did that expression only accidentally flow from his pen? Or was not this rather a blow at the Lutherans, his opponents? Was it not these whose doctrine of the relation between election and faith he meant to represent as erroneous and false?

This question is very important in order to form an unbiased judgment of the situation at that time. Whoever is guided merely by party interest will catch at any straw and be satisfied with anything which looks like an answer. But he who wants to penetrate to rock bottom history must give a satisfactory answer to the question: How did Beza, only six years after the adoption of the Formula of Concord, come to stigmatize, as Pelagianism, over against the Lutheran Andreæ, the doctrine, that the contemplation of "foreseen faith" as a cause of election is Pelagianism? Since that time Calvinists have made this a standing charge against us Lutherans that our doctrine of the election of believers is Pelagianism. Did Beza intend the same

thing? Did he understand the doctrine of the Lutherans of the Formula of Concord to mean that particular election embraces believers as such and has, therefore, respect to foreseen faith? And if Beza understood the Lutherans to advocate this interpretation, was such interpretation without the support of facts or simply the creature of his imgaination? Did they not really teach thus? Beza knew undoubtedly the writings of the Lutheran theologians; he knew the Formula of Concord and the general understanding among Lutherans of this mooted point. Would he have flung such a charge into the faces of the Lutherans, had he known, that they taught as regards this point merely what Missourians teach to-day, and interpreted their Formula of Concord precisely as Missouri interprets the same to-day?

Already in the year 1574, twelve years before the colloquy above referred to, and six years before the adoption of the Formula of Concord, Andreæ in a debate about predestination had laid down the following theses:

"Predestination and election of grace is the eternal counsel of God to save those men who repent of their sins and believe in Christ, the Savior and only Redeemer of the world. It is the immutable will of God, that all should believe the Gospel and that all who believe the Gospel should be saved. Equally immutable is His will, that those should be condemned who do not believe. The universality of the promises of the Gospel is in no way contradicted by the particularism of election. For (mark the proof) God has promised eternal salvation not to all men without exception but alone to believers. Therefore particular election is included in the general promise."*

* This, that particular election is included in the general promise is the chief point in the present controversy. The Formula of Concord and also the authors and signers of this document made the final election of persons rest on the general promises of divine grace as an adequate foundation. Thus particular election becomes the corallary of the general promise. Therefore they emphasized so strongly the fact in the Formula of Concord itself, that the doctrine of election has been revealed in the Word and that the right meaning of the same must be learned in the Gospel of Christ. Therefore they said that our eternal election has been proclaimed to us by Christ in such passages as the following: "This is the will of Him that send me, that every one who seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have eternal life." "God so loved the world" etc. But Missouri finds in such passages no reference to election, it does not find election involved in the general promises, but says that that is quite

In the year 1585 Æg. Hunnius had treated of the doctrine of election quite at length in his excellent commentary on John, and entirely in the sense of his definition rendered on that occasion: "Predestination or election is the eternal counsel of God by which God without respect to human merit, solely out of grace, in Christ and His merits apprehended by faith, has decreed to save all those of whom He foresaw and foreknew according to His prescience that they would repent and believe in Christ, His Son and Savior of the world."

It is very probable that Beza was not ignorant of the doctrine of election as held and set forth by such a prominent Lutheran.

And in the same year, 1586, in which the colloquy of Moempelgart took place (whether before or after we do not know, neither does it matter) Andreæ published a dissertation on election, in which he says explicitly: "We must teach that election has taken place in Jesus Christ according to the revealed Word of God and the God therein revealed, that whosoever believeth in Jesus and apprehends Him as his Savior, should not doubt, that he is predestined and elected to eternal life. Just as election presupposes the merits of Christ, and the knowledge of Him through faith, thus the decree of condemnation presupposes unbelief and the rejection of Christ.*

---

a different matter. "The universal counsel of salvation with its universal promises, 'Whosoever believeth on the Son shall be saved, etc.', is one thing; but the particular election from the mass of equal sinners, which determines absolutely and unconditionally who among them shall really be saved and therefore come to faith and be preserved in it, is quite a different thing." This election, which in no sense depends upon future faith, is a thing differing altogether from anything that can be discovered in any doctrine or universal promise of the Gospel. It is quite a new and other Gospel (Gal. 1, 18).

* Take note: Andreæ in the first place says expressly: "Election does not only presuppose the merits of Christ (which Missouri admits), but also the knowledge of Christ through faith (which Missouri with Beza rejects and stigmatizes as Pelagianism); in the second place Andreæ sees a parallelism between election and reprobation and says, that just as one presupposes faith, thus the other presupposes unbelief." Exactly the clear doctrine of the later dogmaticians! If, therefore, these as "intuitu fidei theologians" have departed from the Scripture and Confession with their doctrine of election, the same judgment arraigns already Andreæ and the whole Church and theological school of his time. The above thesis of Andreæ contains the exact opposite to that of Beza, so that the one contradicts the other as thesis and antithesis.

The theses of Andreæ show us, how Beza came to charge the Luther-

"If therefore, faith is called a cause of election"— how would a Missourian have been compelled to continue? Surely in this manner: "A false doctrine is taught in any event, for even if the explanation is added, that faith is a work of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of election is not thereby established as true, just because it is untrue and remains untrue, that foreseen faith is a postulate or preliminary condition of the singling out of particular persons to the sure laying hold of salvation.*

---

ans with Pelagianism on account of their doctrine of election in view of foreseen faith. This accusation is made by Beza twice in his annotations to the New Testament which had already appeared twice before 1586. The doctrine of the Lutherans was well known to him and he knew at whom he aimed when he placed into the hands of Andreæ the written thesis: "It is false that foreseen faith or good works are a cause of predestination, or of the elect; which is the doctrine of the Pelagians."

And what did Andreæ answer? Does he say: Thou art right, Beza, whoever, in any sense whatever, calls faith a cause of election teaches falsely concerning predestination however correctly he may teach of faith as a work of the Holy Spirit; for faith flows from election and depends upon it, therefore how can it be a cause of the same; therefore no Lutheran teaches thus, but we teach unanimously, that particular election to salvation has taken place without regard to future faith, achieving its end only through the giving of faith and preservation in the same? No, Andreæ does not reject at all the expression, "Faith is a cause of election", but rather saves it from the opprobrium of Pelagianism. His antithesis is the following: "Faith in Jesus is not a creation of nature nor of human powers but of the Holy Spirit. When, therefore, faith is called a cause of election, it does not savor of the tenets of Pelagians who have attributed to the powers of nature what alone can be wrought by the Holy Spirit."

* Cf. Dr. Walther's strange antithesis in his edition of Baier. The thesis of Baier reads: "The subordinate, external impulsive cause of the degree of election is faith in Jesus, persevering faith." To this Dr. W. added the antithesis: "Hollazius: Faith in Jesus is in spite of being a gift of the grace of God a cause of our justification and salvation in time, why therefore should He not have had a cause in eternity for our justification and salvation?" Baier and Hollazius agree perfectly and yet the statement of Hollazius is said to be the antithesis to that of Baier. Hollazius says in his so-called antithesis exactly the same as Andreæ, besides Chemnitz, the chief representative of the Formula of Concord, when already in 1586 he contended against Beza. Why should poor Hollazius as one of the later dogmaticians bare his back and Andreæ go scott free? It would have been a strange sight to quote one of the chief authors of the Formula of Concord in the antithesis to this utterance of Baier. Therefore one must do the best he can under the circumstances.

IV.

With what rapidity time and men can change; when in the year 1879 a private colloquy was held in Columbus, without, however, resulting in an improvement of the situation, it was agreed to convene once more in the following year. We then expressed the request that all undertake a scriptural investigation of the subject, inasmuch as our conscience was bound by the Word of God. "No," Dr. Walther emphatically replied, "we shall take you to the Formula of Concord, we want to know whether you are a Lutheran."

But since the historical documents from the time of the Formula of Concord have been brought to the light of day in such plentitude, and there is no more question about the sense the original Church of the Formula of Concord attached to the Confession, the effort is made in the camp of the Missourians, to make it appear as though we appealed to the fathers to the detriment of the sole authority of the Holy Scriptures. Missouri, which until quite recently had made more use of the testimonies of the fathers than any other section of our Church, suddenly sets herself up as defender of scriptural authority over against "traditional exegesis" and the "doctrine transmitted from the fathers." The matter has its humorous side, and it would be no trouble to place side by side with each other a series of Missourian opinions concerning the fathers from past and from recent times. The comparison would be richly productive of humor. But the matter has also is sad side, for the leaders of the Missouri Synod know very well the point involved in the gathering of the multitudinous testimonies of the "Fathers"; but as they have followed successfully such tactics in the past, they now once more desire to draw the attention of their adherents from the real point at issue and to create the appearance that the disagreement between the Scriptures and the fathers constitutes the issue.

But the situation is far otherwise. The divine truth and correctness of our doctrine, as being a constituent part of His revelation and will, we shall endeavor to substantiate only from the Scriptures, the only source, rule, and measure of the Christian faith. Great is our satisfaction when we sit as eager learners at the feet of the fathers and try to penetrate into the sense of the Holy Scriptures with their aid, just as teachers now living can afford us most desirable help in apprehending the true sense

of Scripture; but whatever thanks the fathers merit for their interpretation and exposition of the Holy Scriptures, the principle shall, notwithstanding, be maintained among us opponents of Missouri that the Word of God is the sole judge of doctrine and that the interpretations of the fathers are of value to us only in so far as they aid us in extracting the sense of Holy Scripture. It is calumny on the part of our opponents, to try to convince their readers that we replace the Holy Scriptures by the fathers as the source and rule of our faith.

What Lutheran, who enjoys the full command of his senses, would think of appealing to his Confessions over against a Calvinist or papist as proof for the correctness of his belief? But as soon as other questions are raised, for instance: What is Lutheran belief? What is the teaching and confesssion of the Lutheran Church as distinguished from Rome and Geneva? — then, without a doubt, the Lutheran Confession and the history of the doctrinal discussions of that time assume decided prominence.

Missouri claims to hold fast to the Lutheran Confession with all fidelity, and especially to the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord. Not only we, the living opponents, but also all later dogmaticians, at least those from Gerhard to Hollazius (1615-1725) are charged by Missouri with a departure from the Confession and the establishment of an antisymbolical doctrine of predestination. The present topic, therefore, deals not with a proper understanding of the Holy Scriptures, but solely with the right understanding of the eleventh article. Both parties, Missouri and her "opponents," appeal with all energy to the Symbol and take pains to prove from that their definition of election, and to confirm and establish their doctrine as true to the historical and dogmatical development of the Lutheran Church. The issue between us is: Who has the Lutheran Confession upon his side in the controversy on predestination?

If we had only the words of the Symbol themselves, we should be compelled to establish our point over against our opponents on the strength of these alone. But if we have in addition the historical documents of those times relative to the doctrinal discussions, and if these documents cast a bright light upon the very questions at issue, it would be not only stupid, but also dishonest and disingenuous, to push these documents aside under the pretext that only the text of the Symbol is binding, and that

these comments and explanations of the original defenders and signers of the Symbol are only "private writings" without any value for a correct construction of the Confession! If Missouri wants to act honestly, she dare not speak of the constructions that the later dogmaticians placed upon symbolical statements, and of their departure from the Symbol, but she must go back to the Church of the Formula of Concord herself, whose explanations concerning the points at issue are extant in massive bulk. An old German proverb says: "Every one is the best expositor of his own words." In the same manner the Church of the Formula of Concord, which has signed and accepted the eleventh article as her Confession is the best expositor of the same. If this Church has given her definitions unanimously and with unmistakable clearness, it is a sign of disingenuousness, a disregard of truth and justice, to palm off the opposite doctrine which has been expressly condemned and rejected, as the sense of the Confession from the lips of the Church. The subterfuge, that the whole Church of that time, all the districts of the fatherland from Luebeck and Rostock in the North to Tuebingen and Stuttgart in the South have been guilty of a departure from the Symbol, is too ridiculous a claim to be made seriously by any one.

By the providence of God the unanimous testimony of that Church is before us in numerous documents and statements. Already the writings and documents of the time when the Formula of Concord was still in the stage of discussion and also of the time immediately following, furnish the irrefutable proof that the Church of that time conceived the particular election of persons as embracing not certain sinners as such but the future believers in Christ as such. Thus and not otherwise did she understand the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord and therefore she afterwards on many occasions adduced quotations from the eleventh article as containing and expressing the above definition of election. Whoever, therefore, wants to act honestly, honor the truth, and do justice to the Lutheran Confession, must go back to the discussions, testimonies, and documents of that time. But whoever does not want to comply with this requirement, thereby manifests before all the world that he has no respect for truth and right, but merely desires to hold fast and defend, under any pretext, claims once made. Such people must be left as blind leaders of the blind to the judgment of God.

We have repeatedly mentioned the fact that the Huberian controversy (1592-1598) supplies an admirable test of the sense of the eleventh article. Only twelve years had elapsed after the breaking out of this controversy, when with the greatest celerity it had spread over all sections of the Lutheran Church. Huber addressed himself orally and in writing to the seats of correct theological learning, and accounts of the proceedings are extant in accurate detail. (Cf. Walch Bibliotheca II, 645; also Rehtmeier, Braunschweig's Historie contains several documents.) Everywhere the men that dealt with Huber in this matter were original signers of the Formula of Concord; in Rostock it was the venerable Chytræus, last of the authors of this great Symbol. The question raised by Huber was not a new one, but, as especially recorded by Selnecker, one which had been on the tapis already during the discussions on the Formula of Concord, and had been settled by the authors entirely in harmony with the opposition which Huber arrayed against himself later.

At that time three definitions of election were the shibboleths of the contending hosts: In the first place, the Calvinistic conception, according to which only "certain men" as such have been, without regard to future faith, ordained to eternal life out of the multitude of men in the same ruin, and therefore have also been ordained to all the means for securing the same, including steadfastness in faith. In the second place, the Huberian definition, according to which election, agreeably to Calvinstic doctrine, was a foreordination unto salvation and unto the means for securing the same including faith and, therefore, without regard to future repentance or faith, but unlike the Calvinistic dogma embracing not "certain persons" but all men without exception, being in consequence not particular but universal. In the third place, the Lutheran conception, according to which final election has been particular (over gainst the Huberians), embracing not "certain persons" as such or sinners contemplated as being in the same condition with all other sinners (over against the Calvinists) but only foreseen believers, and has therefore taken place with regard to the merits of Christ apprehended during the time of life (over against both Huberians and Calvinists).

The perverse narrowing of the conception of election on the part of the Calvinists as well as the equally perverse extension of the same excludes faith as a causative agency from the elective decree. This is the point which demands our attention once

more, inasumch as Missouri compromises with both Huber and the Calvinists in this matter. It was impossible that in the discussions with Huber this central point should not be discussed with ever increasing interest and vigor. All possible pains were taken to define the existing differences as much as possible and to induce the several parties to avoid vagueness in both conception and definition, especially since Huber, quite ignorant of the facts in the case, charged the Lutherans with being friendly to the Calvinistic standpoint in teaching particularism. Again and again the theologians of Wittenberg, of Rostock, of Luebeck, of Brunswick, of Wuertemberg replied that they taught not a mere arbitrary election of certain persons, but an election of believers in Jesus Christ, that is, not an absolute election in the Calvinistic sense, but a conditional election according to the Gospel. A person would be a perfect embodiment of mendacity, if he would read these documents and yet claim that the original Church of the Formula of Concord has known nothing of an election of believers as such, and that "the later dogmaticians" had secured the acceptance of this false definition of election, thus becoming guilty of a departure from the Symbol. No, this evangelical definition of election as a setting apart of "believers as such" reigned supreme already in the original Church of the Formula of Concord, and among the authors, signers, and representatives living at that time. Whatever the situation may have been before the acceptance of the Formula of Concord, let it be understood, we do not speak of the time when as yet no eleventh article existed, but of the right understanding of the Confession as received by the Lutheran Church at that time and having ever since the force of a Symbol. The question is: How did the Church understand this article at that time? And this is no question at all for any one who will let the teachers of the Church of that time decide the question! It might possibly be a question, whether the Church at that time understood or misunderstood her Confession when she adopted it. Or the question might be, whether the authors, signers, and representatives of the eleventh article understood the same properly when it was received, but later, denying this sense over against Huber, imagined instead of the true sense a new one, which they then insinuated into the Confession and since that time put into circulation as the well known faith of the Church.

The decision having been rendered as to the definition of

election which the Lutheran Church maintained during the years 1580-1600 does in the nature of the case not involve the answer to the question, whether this conception of election is correct according to the Scriptures. He would be a queer Lutheran, or Protestant for that matter, who would say: "I cannot see that the Lutheran definition of election formed at that time comports with that which is found in passages like Rom. 8, 29; Eph. 1, 4; Matt. 20 and 22; however I am a Lutheran and therefore it behooves me to subordinate my private opinion to the judgment of my Church." That would be tantamount to committing idolatry with the fair name of the Lutheran Church. Whoever comes to the conclusion that he has found in the Holy Scriptures another conception of election than has been propounded in his Church, has a perfect right to subject his view of the doctrine to a new test and to draw it, to speak with Luther, from the Scripture once and again, but let him beware of setting aside the authority of the Word of God for that of the Church. If Missouri therefore comes to the conclusion, that the Church in the Formula of Concord, in the eleventh article of this Symbol, as received and interpreted by herself, has both set up and received an erroneous definition of election, she has the right to go back to the Scriptures and to demonstrate that the Lutheran Church at that time has been in error. That would comport very well with probity and virtue. But it is quite another thing, to impute to the Lutheran Church of that time, in defiance of all historical documents, a definition of election which it has been demonstrated was foreign to her, or the insertion in her Confession of a definition of election which, as a matter of fact, she has combated and spurned, as Calvinistic, unchristian, and heathenish, whenever it was advocated. This is the attitude of Missouri; another construction of the article of election is foisted upon the Confession than that which the very Church originating it put upon it and recognized as the truly symbolical and Lutheran definition of this important doctrine.

This is seen beyond a doubt in the fact that the Church of the Formula of Concord knew of no election to salvation excepting that which embraced the believers in Jesus, while Huber and the Calvinists rejected this conception of election as antichristian and false. The final elective decree unto salvation relates according to Missouri only to certain persons or men without previous regard to future faith, and not to believers as such. Missouri, it

is true, does not define election as extending to all men, but with the Calvinists as limited to some men, but agrees with both Huber and the Calvinists in this that not believers as such in signo rationis (according to logical definition) were elected to eternal life, but merely and simply some men as men or as sinners, contemplated as being in the same condition as all other men. This is precisely the Calvinistic definition of election which the fathers of the Formula of Concord rejected again and again as antiscriptural, but which Missouri in spite of the unanimous protest of those fathers and of the whole Lutheran Church since that time, claims to have discovered in the eleventh article.

Let us hear, for the purpose of confirming what has just been said, a number of utterances coming from the fathers of the Formula of Concord.

The Wittenberg men, for instance, write: Huber speaks: "Nowhere is it written in the Book of Concord that God has sealed and ordained to eternal life certain few or particular persons in His eternal will." Answer: "It has never entered our mind that God, in His eternal will, merely because it so pleased Him, has ordained certain persons to eternal life irrespective of faith. Therefore, his exception is applicable not to us but to the Calvinists. (And to-day we could add: to the Missourians.) It is just this which we chide in Dr. Huber as well as in the Calvinists, on the strength of the Holy Scriptures, that they consider the anterior and absolute will of God as the only element in the election of grace, though Dr. Huber wishes to be understood that he includes Jesus Christ in the act of election;* but inasmuch as he makes unappropriated by faith Christ an element in predestination it remains a Christ with blessings unimparted. But we say that predestination and election to salvation belongs to the subsequent will of God. In harmony with this we do not teach that the paucity of the elect is to be explained by a certain counsel, will or decree of God, but only by the unbelief and contumacy of men." (Gründliche Widerlegung, page 162.)

"This particularism that God is said to have elected certain

* Just as Missouri professes to-day that no absolute election is taught because (like Huber) it bases election upon the merits of Christ (but only as gained and offered, not as apprehended in faith). As though this would make the elective will of God less arbitrary in its relation to men.

and particular persons irrespective of faith, merely because it pleased the Lord, we deem Calvinistic and unchristian." (Page 5.)

We reject the opposite doctrine in which it is held, either that God did not know from eternity how men would dispose themselves toward His holy counsels formed for the purpose of their salvation, or foreknowing that some would yield while the majority would not, that He has not been influenced thereby in His counsels and decrees. We consider either view to be unchristian and heathenish.

"Also when the number of the elect is considered, a great difference will be found between our true doctrine and the error of the Calvinists. For the Calvinists say, that God has elected particular persons for no other reason than that He has a predilection for those in distinction from others, without having regard to faith; and that the number of such persons is unmistakably determined, that no enlargement and diminuition of the same is possible. Both claims we reject according to the Word of God." (Page 132.)

"The question concerning our doctrine of election is: Whether it is based upon the secret will of God and whether it is the outcome of the decretum absolutum, i. e. the decree which God has formed according to His free, unchangeable and absolute will, without condition whatever, or whether the doctrine of election is to be sought in the revealed will of God and the holy order established in conformity with it. Within this order and will, He will exercise either grace or justice toward men, according as they yield or resist." (Leyser, Antihuber, page 65.) The former, Leyser holds, is the doctrine of the Calvinists: "As though everything which man was to experience as regards his salvation had been determined by God, in eternity so absolutely and without condition and provision that it could not happen otherwise."

"If, now, all men would receive with believing hearts the Word of God and the merits of Christ, it is certain that all men would be elect children of God, and the universality of election would be a fact, as Huber believes. But as the seed of the Word of God is received according to Christ's teaching in the parable of the seed (Luke 8) only in the fourth part by believing hearts and permitted to bear fruit, it is the inevitable consequence that in the application of election, which is made in time, a process of singling out occurs so that not all men, on account of the

unbelief of many, are elected to salvation. For God has so formed His counsel in eternity, that all men, if they would believe, could be elected and become partakers of salvation. But inasmuch as He has foreseen and foreknown that not all would believe but that the larger part would make themselves unworthy of grace through the seduction of Satan and their own unbelief, God's counsel has been so fashioned that the wrath of God shall remain upon those who exclude themselves by unbelief from the election of grace in the time of grace; these as children of wrath shall never be among the number of the elect." (Leyser against Huber, page 21.)

"There are at this day three views concerning the election of men to eternal life. The first view holds that election is based upon Christ and determined by the order established of God. This is the view of the orthodox who receive the doctrine of the Book of Concord. The second view is that of the Calvinists according to which they teach that a certain and small number of men have been absolutely elected irrespective of faith in Christ Jesus, while the remainder have been rejected by a mere decision of the will of God, without in any way considering their unbelief. The third view is that of Huber according to which all men without regard to faith or unbelief, church membership or spiritual isolation, have been elected to eternal salvation in the true sense of the term. We shall now first of all furnish that definition of election which is in accordance with the doctrine of our Church: Predestination is the eternal counsel or decree of God according to which God, the Father, in His mere good pleasure and gracious compassion, has, in His Son, elected to eternal life and decided surely to save all those who repent and truly believe in Jesus Christ, and remain in His faith to the end; while the remainder who do not believe or who die in unbelief after falling from the faith, have been passed and left, not on account of an absolute decree of limitation, but solely on account of their impenitence and unbelief." (Hunnius, Tractatus De Præd., page 126, 127.)

In reference to certain exceptions to the Book of Concord on the part of the Huberians (and to-day of the Missourians), the Wittenberg men write as follows: "Huber says that it is written in the Book of Concord that there is no other cause of election than the grace of God and His merits, whereby Hunnianism is demolished." The words which Dr. Huber has in

mind read as follows: "By this doctrine and definition of the eternal and saving election of the chosen children of God, the sole glory is given to God, inasmuch as He saves us without our merits or good works according to the purpose of His will, as it is written Eph. 1: 'Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He has made us accepted in the Beloved.' Therefore it is false and wrong, when it is taught that not only the grace and the holy merits of Christ but something in us also is a cause on account of which God has elected us unto eternal life." These words are directed not against us but against the papists, and also against the self-righteous and synergists. For we do not say that faith is a cause in us, on account of which God has elected us. For though faith does belong to predestination, it is accorded place not as a quality, virtue or good work in us, but in so far as it appropriates and puts within us the Lord Jesus Christ and His holy merits so that it is not faith in itself but solely the merits of Christ apprehended by faith which is a cause of our election by God. It is false when Dr. Huber imputes to us the view that we have been elected propter fidem (on account of faith); this imputation has been refuted above. But that the Book of Concord did not want to exclude faith in Christ in the paragraph in question is patent from the fact that it mentions among the eight requirements which belong to the election of grace also faith in Jesus as was explained above when the issue was stated. And first of all we have heard that God 'in His eternal divine counsel has determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe in Him.' If faith did not belong to the eternal counsel of God respecting our election, for some other reason than that it is no meritorious cause or a cause on account of which we are elected, then saving faith, thus viewed, should be stricken also from the article of justification as has been repeatedly pointed out and sufficiently explained." (163.)

Hunnius also quotes the well-known passage from the Book of Concord (Mueller 723, 87, 88) to which Missouri and Huber appeal, and continues: "The very letter of the words testifies that it is not faith in Jesus which is expelled from the counsel of election but human works and merits. This is, furthermore, taught in the affixed quotation and exposition of that passage of

Paul (Rom. 9): 'That the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of Him that calleth, It was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger.' Huber's own quotation is his best refutation. For when it is said that there is nothing in us, on account of which we are elected, it is evident that by this phraseology (on account of which) human merit is meant, and that by this expression not we are impugned but the papists, who boast of the merits of their works. Faith is not a constituent element of election on account of its worthiness or merit. Therefore we do not say that we have been elected to eternal life on account of faith, but on account of Christ, and are contemplated with favor in virtue of the merit of Christ and the saving knowledge of Him. Through faith we are elected, not as being a quality or virtue in us, but as having gone outside of ourselves to apprehend the foundation of our election, Jesus Christ. And what the Book of Concord affirms regarding predestination, it affirms also regarding justification and salvation, that God does not justify and save on account of anything inherent in us, albeit He does not justify and save without faith apprehending its object. Far from expunging faith from the eternal purpose of God respecting election the F. C. affirms in explicit words that God has determined in the eternal decree of election that He would save no one except those who acknowledge and truly believe in His Son." (Tractatus, p. 654 and fil.)

The Rostock men, among them the venerable Chytræus, write: "The merciful will of God burning in love toward mankind is this, that all men should be elected, justified, and saved, namely through faith in Jesus. But because not all men believe, God does not account all men without distinction as elect and recipients at His hands of righteousness and salvation in Christ, though He wills concerning all that they should be elected and saved if they believe. (Quos tamen omnes voluisset elegi et salvari, si credidissent.) We have told Huber on several occasions and repeated it during our last conversation when he bade us farewell, that the true and complete definition of election according to Scripture and the Book of Concord embraces not only the gracious will of God, the merits of Christ, and the general promises, but also true and steadfast faith in the mercy of God and Christ, the Mediator and Savior of the whole human race, because Christ is of no advantage without faith, and all requirements of the Holy

Scriptures demand faith in express terms." (Rehtmeier, Braunschweig's K. Hist. IV. Beilagen, p. 191.)

Furthermore: "With reference to the phrase: election in the wider sense, we repeat, if it is not acceptable to call 'the will of God in Christ, according to which He earnestly desires the salvation of all men,' predestination, it is not meet to start a controversy on this account, if only the essential things and the salutary, comforting doctrine are held fast. For when the understanding of the matter has been established, we should be of a yielding disposition in the use of phrases and words. And as we do not doubt, that there is the most blessed harmony in the doctrine of election among us, we can on both sides retain the expression: predestination in the wider sense, treating of the complete predestination of the individual to be saved — of which the Book of Concord treats and which is the subject under discussion — is truly and essentially universal, embracing all men, both Jew and Gentile, who know Jesus, the Son of God and Savior of the world in faith, and remain in this faith to the end; just as the righteousness which avails before God is universal unto and upon all them that believe. For there is no difference, Rom. 3. But those who do not believe remain in the judgment and under the wrath of God forever. Therefore they are not said to be elect, but to be cast away."

The theologians of Wuertemberg (both those of the Tuebingen and Stuttgart schools) are no less explicit in stating what was the definition of election of the original Church of the Formula of Concord. They write: "It is is not only improper as to sense and form, but absolutely false, when Huber says that God has elected all men sine respectu vel ante omnem respectum fidei, i. e. without regard to faith. Said Huber lays down and defends a doctrine of universal election such that the particular election of believers, of which the Holy Scriptures and the Formula of Concord treat and which embraces the believers and pious children of God, can nowhere stand beside it. Moreover, he charges those pure teachers who contend earnestly for this election, on the strength of the Holy Scriptures and the Formula of Concord, quite groundlessly and falsely with Calvinism. The passages of Holy Scripture which treat of the election of the believing children of God, he perverts in order to make them subserve his false opinion. Divine predestination, in the narrow sense, is election of particular persons, inasmuch as it is limited alone to

those who apprehend in true faith the grace of God and the merits of Christ and keep the same to the end. For it is nothing else but the eternal will, counsel, and pleasure of God, to save by the foolishness of preaching those who believe. (Acta Huberiana, Part I., pp. 2 and 3.)

"Thou (Huber) formerly, hast given us plainly to understand that thou disapprovedst of the doctrine of the Calvinists in refusing to believe a particular election, as they teach that certain persons shall be saved through an unconditional and fatalistic decree. We have not been able to conceive that thou desirest the destruction of the orthodox sense of the Formula of Concord according to which election embraces children of God. We see from this that the cause of thy error is a failure to comprehend the existence of a middle path (aliquod medium) between the universal love of God and the absolute decree regarding some few as certain of salvation, even that order of God according to which He elects all believers in Christ and has denied salvation to all outside of these." (Page 71) Huber had written: "In the first place I do not find any erroneous doctrine in the Book of Concord." On this the Wuertemberg men comment in the following manner: "From this it is evident that Huber's glory, when he appeals to the Formula of Concord, is vain and mere fencing before a mirror. Huber says: 'All men even unbelievers have been elected to salvation.' The Book of Concord says the contrary. . . . Huber does not want to consider faith and perseverance as elements in the act of predestination and holds that faith has to do with nothing but the application and appropriation of offered grace during life, the time of grace. But the Book of Concord counts among the eight elements which belong to predestination also justification and perseverance in faith and insists upon including all this and excluding none of the things mentioned, when we speak of the counsel, predestination, election, and foreordination of God.*

"Therefore as often as Huber appeals to the Book of Concord we should know that he does not proceed honestly but contemplates treachery." (Page 215.)

---

* In the Latin original the words read as follows on page 185: "Concordiæ Liber inter octa requisita, quæ ad electionis actam pertinent, etiam fidem, justificationem et perseverantiam in fide requirit, nec quiquam horum excludendum censet, cum de prædestinatione ad vitam aeternam agitur."

As formerly the Calvinists always pretended that at one time, they and the Lutherans had been one, but that the innovation was introduced later, so also Huber wrote that Hunnius had invented a new dogma in teaching a particularism in election. Thereupon the Wuertemberg men answered: "How can Dr. Huber say that Dr. Hunnius has given currency and support to the doctrine from animosity against himself, when this doctrine has been adopted by our Church many years ago with greatest unanimity and approval." (Page 214.)

Concerning the difference between the Lutheran and the Calvinistic definition of election, the Wuertemberg fathers of the Formula of Concord say the following: "Immense is the difference between our pure doctrine of the particular election of the children of God, as it is presented in the Formula of Concord, and that of the Calvinists. By our doctrine the people are directed to the revealed will of God and the true Book of Life, namely Jesus Christ, being taught that all those are elected in Jesus Christ who truly repent and believe in Jesus Christ. The Calvinistic view of election or predestination rests upon a mere decree of God who has purposed and resolved by Himself to save some persons, albeit He did not contemplate that they, in faith, would apprehend Christ, and in Him righteousness and salvation." (Page 270.)

"When the question is raised as to predestination proper, and information is sought about the persons whom God has elected to eternal life, i. e. to whom God would give the kingdom of glory and eternal salvation, it is answered rightly, that not all men, but only believers are elected to eternal life. This is the very thing found plainly in the Christian Book of Concord. The words read: "Predestination or election embraces only the pious, well-pleasing children of God." (Page 294.)

"For we cannot deny, but must affirm as desiring to speak properly and according to the rule of divine truth, that God gives eternal life not to all men but to those who believe. And that is intended to be taught also by St. Paul when he says that we are elected in Christ before the foundation of the world." (Page 292.)

V.

"The Scriptures teach that God desires the salvation of all men by the knowledge of the truth, but that those, in particular, have been predestinated and ordained to salvation by Him who

perseveringly believe in Christ. This universal order, or rather universal will of God, that the whole human race should be restored by faith in Jesus, we do not deny. Another matter is the predestination and ordination to salvation which is mentioned and described in the Confession and Scriptures, inasmuch as the latter is confined to those who apprehend and appropriate to themselves the gracious counsel and will of God concerning the restoration of the whole human race. 'This predestination and ordination has taken place in Christ'—not, however, apart from faith or irrespective of faith, without which Christ profits us nothing." (Page 305.)

In the second part of the Acta Huberiana (p. 7) the Wuertemberg men cite the following points as false doctrines of Huber: "He recognizes only one will of God, namely the universal will, to save all men through Jesus Christ. But the ordinate will of God, according to which God decrees and ordains that only believers are to be saved, but unbelievers and the impenitent to be condemned, he denies over against the Holy Scriptures and the Formula of Concord. Denying the same he finds in it a contradiction of the universal will. . . . Huber teaches falsely, furthermore concerning predestination when he maintains: 1. That God from eternity has elected all men to eternal life in Christ before and without any regard to faith, no matter whether men are future believers or not; 2. that besides this election there is no other on the part of God; 3. this universal election he holds to be an irreconcilable contradiction to the particular election of believers; 4. the particular election of believers which is taught in Scripture and again affirmed in the Book of Concord, he denies, saying that it is not found in God; he brands it as Pelagianism and Calvinism, and he blasphemes, calling it a vain phantom and abyss of despair; . . . 8. the particular election of believers (which is found in the Bible and Book of Concord) overthrows, as he maintains, the universal will of God, according to which all men are to be saved."

With reference to Huber's appeal to earlier Lutheran teachers the Wuertemberg men say: "These do not defend the errors of Huber, for not one of them has excluded from the act of election the consideration of faith; not one of them has opposed election in a wider sense to the particular election of believers which is taught in the Formula of Concord according to the Word of God; not one has denied the latter or blasphemed it

after the manner of Huber, but the majority of them have approved the particular election of believers on the part of God (not the absolute election of the Calvinists). Page 8.

Besides the universal will of God and His pleasure to save all men through Christ who is to be apprehended in faith, the Book of Concord treats of this specific election with such explicitness and avowed directness, that we should think no man in his sound senses could or would deny it. For 1. right in the beginning, where the Epitome treats of the difference between foreknowledge and foreordination, the following words are found: 'Foreknowledge embraces at the same time the good and the bad,' etc., 'but predestination, or the eternal election of God embraces only the pious, well-pleasing children of God.' 2. In the sixth paragraph we read: 'Christ is the Book of Life, in whom all are written and elected who are to be saved (qui salutem aeternam consequuntur). But not all men attain to eternal salvaltion, though God had willed according to His antecedent will that all men should be saved; but men have themselves neglected the means of salvation. 3. In this way the eternal election of the Father is to be sought in Christ, who has decreed in His eternal counsel, that He would save no one except those who acknowledge and believe in His Son Jesus.' 4. And in the Declaratio the first words of the eleventh article read thus: 'Concerning the eternal election of the children of God no controversy has arisen so far among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession.' In these words the particular scope of the subsequent treatise, namely the election of the children of God, is surely given. 5. A few lines further down the treatise proper contains the following words: 'In the first place the difference between the foreknowledge of God and the election of the children of God is to be diligently noted, for the foreknowledge of God embraces all creatures of God, both good and evil,' etc., 'but the eternal election of God or foreordination to salvation does not embrace both good and evil but only the children of God elected and ordained to eternal life before the foundations of the world were laid.' 6. Again we read: 'When we desire to speak and meditate profitably upon the predestination or election of the children of God to eternal life, we should accustom ourselves not to speculate on the secret, hidden and ineffable purpose of God, but we should view the counsel, decree and foreordination as they are presented in Jesus Christ, who is the true Book of Life. The

whole doctrine of the purpose, counsel, will and foreordination of God respecting our redemption, call, justification and salvation should be considered as a whole and in its mutual relations according to the example of St. Paul, who has explained this article, Rom. 8 and Eph. 1. . . . Such was the treatment that Christ has accorded this doctrine in the parable of the marriage of the king's son, Matt. 22. 7. At the same place we find among other constituent elements of predestination the following mentioned as fourth in order: 'That He wills to receive into grace, adoption and inheritance of eternal life all those who in true repentance and by true faith receive Jesus Christ.' As fifth we find mentioned: 'That He wills to sanctify those in love whom He has thus justified,' as St. Paul says, Eph. 1. As 6th: 'That He wills to keep them in their great weakness against world, devil and flesh, and guide them upon His way; when they stumble, to raise them; when they are under the cross and in tribulation, to comfort and keep them.' As 7th: 'That He wills to strengthen, and increase in them the good work that He has commenced, and keep them to the end, provided (si modo), they hold to the Word of God, are instant in prayer, remain in the grace of God and make diligent use of the gifts received.' As 8th. 'That He wills to bestow eternal joy and glory upon those whom He has elected, called and justified,' 8. And finally these words are added: "All this (namely the items above mentioned) is embraced in Holy Scripture in the doctrine of the eternal election of the children of God to sonship and salvation; all this should be understood by election, nor should it ever be excluded and omitted, when we speak of the purpose, foreknowledge, election and foreordination of God.' All this, quoted from the Book of Concord, proves conclusively, that besides the universal will of God, according to which all men are to be saved through the appointed means, there is taught as a subordinate element to the former the election proper of the faithful and children of God. This is the subsequent will of God, according to which God, having regard to faith and unbelief (respiciens), has elected only believers to eternal life (Solos credentes). (Page 38-39.)

The rejoinder of the Wittenberg men is followed immediately by that of the Wuertembergers who answer entirely in harmony with the former the arguments of Huber, and now of Missouri, ostensibly drawn from the Book of Concord: 1. "Thou sayest: 'How could regard be had to faith in election, since faith

in man belongs to time, but the act of election to eternity?' We answer: 'Yea, how can that be? In what other way than by the foreknowledge, or strictly speaking the omniscience of God. For, to speak properly, God foreknows nothing, but sees everything, past or future as present before Him. Therefore He has not only forseen the faith of men from all eternity, namely those who would receive the Word of the Gospel in true faith, those who persevere, those who fall away, or neglect entirely the preaching of the Gospel, but He has also known most accurately the number of the elect.' 2. 'But it is expressly prohibited, in the Book of Concord, to draw conclusions from the foreknowledge of God concerning election, its extent and nature.' We reply: 'The words of the Formula of Concord signify something entirely different if they are rightly weighed. For the Book of Concord does not absolutely and entirely exclude the foreknowledge of God from this article, but prohibits merely this: that the doctrine of election be confined to the inexplicable, hidden counsel of God, as though (quasi) it contained no other element (nihil praterea), or was to be limited to the mere foreknowing of which persons were to be saved or damned. But what those things are which belong to the treatment of this doctrine we have demonstrated from the Book of Concord. The act of election was not consummated without the incarnation, sufferings and death of Christ being foreknown and considered, nor was faith omitted. And Paul in Rom. 8, 29, manifestly deduces election from foreknowledge. Therefore the Book of Concord says at another place: 'And God in such counsel, purpose and foreordination has not only prepared salvation,' etc. 3. 'But, if faith was considered at our election (thou sayest), it becomes a cause of election in us; however the Book of Concord affirms the mercy of God and the merits of Christ to be the sole cause of election (plane totalem); moreover we hear that it has been consummated solely through the gracious application of the merits of Christ; that the Book of Concord does not permit us to add something in us as an additional cause to its completion, or if such a cause is dragged in, it condemns it as a blasphemous doctrine.'* We answer: 'The

* The objections of Huber and the Calvinists are repeated to-day by Calvinizing Missourians. Shall we subscribe to the interpretation of such opponents rather than to that of the original authors and signers? In view of such declarations of the Wittenberg as well as the Tuebingen theologians we must marvel at the colossal impudence of the St. Louis men

same Book of Concord is abundantly able to furnish a clear and exhaustive reply. The Book of Concord by making the grace of God the sole cause of our election in no wise excludes faith, but merely our good works. Therefore the Book referred to speaks thus: 'By this brief definition of the eternal election of God the honor is given alone to God, for it is held that He, out of pure grace, saves us without our merit according to the purpose of His will,' — words which evidently do not exclude faith but good works. For faith can no more be removed from the article of election than from that of justification, and yet neither in the one nor in the other is it presented as an efficient or meritorious cause of salvation. When thou, therefore demandest that a single quotation be advanced confirming the consideration of faith in the act of election, this demand can be complied with by advancing any of those passages which treat of election, or of Christ or of grace, or of the children of God. For all these things include faith, and none of these things has ever been considered in the counsels of God apart from faith. Whoever denies this, disturbs and mutilates the whole order of election and contradicts both the Scriptures and Formula of Concord. . . . We disapprove, therefore, the rejection and the ridicule, on thy part, of the foreknowledge of faith. For just as God has foreseen the unbelief of the Jews and rejected them accordingly, so God has foreseen the faith of believers and elected them on account of Christ, whom they would apprehend in faith, unto eternal life."

The Wuertemberg theologians brand as Calvinistic the following thesis: "God has neither rejected any one on account of foreseen unbelief nor has He elected any one on account of foreseen faith, for He does everything according to His absolute, unconditional, positive will, which is the final cause." As a Lutheran-orthodox rejoinder to this the Wuertemberg theologians propose the following thesis: "The consideration of faith can not be eliminated from election, because God, not absolutely and unconditionally but according to a certain order, decided to save us, viz. in the Savior to be apprehended by faith. And without faith Christ with all His blessings is of no profit to us; but notwithstanding this, nothing is ascribed either to

who style themselves the successors of those "manifestly orthodox" theologians of Wittenberg and Tuebingen, but their opponents as successors of Huber. O tempora, O mores!

human powers, or to the merits of human works, since the reason for justification is the same as that for election. (Cum eadem sit justificationis et electionis nostræ ratio.)"

"Particular election is the eternal act of God, by which He has decided in His counsel according to the purpose of His will to save believers, a definition which Huber shall not destroy, unless he first demolish the Bible and Book of Concord." (Page 162.) "We define according to the Scriptures particular election in this manner: It is the act or counsel of God, the purpose and pleasure of His will, to save believers in Christ." (Page 144.) "Election is the purpose of God, according to which the merciful Father out of grace, in Christ, has elected to eternal life all those whom He has foreseen in His prescience as penitent, and persevering believers in Christ." (Page 163.)

"Between Huber and ourselves," we read on page 71, "the point at issue is not a phrase, since also orthodox theologians have expressed themselves as he has, though in a widely different sense. No, the issue involved is a question of truth and error, whether God has ordained to eternal life all men before and without respect to their faith. To affirm this question, as is done by Huber, means to impiously and blasphemously impugn the justice of God.* A further issue is, the election of believers to eternal life according to His subsequent will, in which He has had regard to faith and unbelief. The position Huber occupies with reference to this issue is inimical both to Scripture and Book of Concord."

"The doctrine of the particular election of believers which is taught in the Holy Scriptures, may contradict the opinion of Huber, but not our doctrine or that of any other pure

* Mark well: not this is found impious and blasphemous in Huber's doctrine that he teaches the universality of election, but rather that he teaches an election to eternal life on the part of God "without and before any consideration of faith." Just in this respect the Missourian definition of election agrees with that of Huber and the Calvinists. As Huber taught then that God has elected all men to eternal life without the consideration of faith, which in the nature of the case involves according to Huber's own admission an election to faith, so Missouri teaches concerning the election of particular persons. If Huber's doctrine impugned the justice of God and was therefore branded as blasphemous by the fathers, how much more does the Missourian doctrine fall under this sweeping condemnation, since their definition of election is identical with that of the Calvinists which the Wittenberg theologians describe as unchristian and heathenish.

theologians. Nor does it vitiate that of universal election, as has been shown conclusively in our treatise from the Word of God as well as from the Book of Concord. The particular election of believers is not contradictory but subordinate to universal election." (Page 74.)

Huber had written: "You postulate a particular election on the part of God and draw the conclusion from it that God, according to a subsequent will, has elected to salvation only believers in Christ. Here we join issue. I can not approve of your thesis, for one reason, because it lacks the form of sound words enjoined and observed in Scripture. The passages adduced by you do not contain a word regarding a particular election, but speak of salvation as the end of those who have appropriated to themselves, by faith, the universal election in Jesus Christ. Hence the phraseology of Scripture: Whosoever believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but nowhere is it written that God has elected believers to eternal life." The Wuertemberg theologians answer: "Huber, according to this, rejects a doctrine derived from the Scriptures and the Book of Concord. For Paul says thus: 'It pleased God to save them that believe.' 1 Cor. 1. And the Book of Concord teaches: 'God has decreed in His eternal counsel that He will save no one except those who acknowledge and truly believe in Christ.' This is an example of the form of sound words in Scripture and the Book of Concord, with which our thesis agrees perfectly. For even according to Huber's opinion these expressions are equivalent as to their meaning: 'To elect to eternal life in Christ,' and 'the good pleasure that men should be saved through Christ.' There are in Scripture expressions of precisely the same meaning relative to the pleasure and will of God concerning believers. These expressions fully cover as to their meaning all we say of particular election, as is seen from the passage quoted and John 6, where we read: 'This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life.' These words not only treat of the historical event but also of the eternal will, pleasure and counsel of God, which govern the history of those whom God has set apart and ordained to eternal life. He who believes has, accordingly, eternal life on the strength of the eternal will of God and His decree of election, as is seen from the passage quoted: 'This is the will of Him, etc.' The only alternative remaining is one which only a demented

person can choose, that believers have eternal life, but without the purpose and pleasure of God as controlling factors in the accomplishment of this result." (Page 98.)

"The proposition that believers have been elected to eternal life agrees with Scripture neither in phraseology nor in substance." The Wuertemberg fathers of the Formula of Concord answer: "In this Huber manifestly contradicts both Scripture and the Formula of Concord. For according to the revealed will of God, which we have ascertained from the Scriptures, God has elected to eternal life believers alone, and rejected unbelievers. Therefore the Formula of Concord has expressed the sense of the Church in the following manner: 'God has decreed in His eternal counsel, that He will save no one except those who acknowledge and truly believe in His Son Jesus Christ.' The same sense is expressed in the Declaratio: 'The eternal counsel or predestination of God, that is His ordination unto salvation does not embrace both good and evil, or believers and non-believers, but only the children of God (that is believers*), who have been ordained to eternal life before the foundation of the world was laid.' These words no sane person, in the enjoyment of his powers of discernment, can apply merely to the end and issue of man's earthly history. Hence it is manifest that these monstrosities of Huber can not be tolerated in orthodox schools. They are in conflict with Scripture and Symbol." (Page 99.)

"Huber plainly contradicts the Book of Concord, when he denies the election of believers on the part of God and charges the advocates of such election with Calvinism and Pelagianism, and when he denominates as a vanity of vanities the doctrine taught in the Book of Concord: God has decreed in His eternal counsel that He will save no one save those who acknowledge His Son Jesus Christ and truly believe in Him." (Page 112.)

Huber, in this respect the precursor of Missourian reformers, had written: "It is of the utmost importance that the Book of Concord expressly warns us, not to derive election from the foreknowledge of God or let the fact of divine foreknowledge influence our definition of election." The Wuertemberg theologians answer: "Those words of the Formula of Concord which Huber

* Let every one bear in mind this authentic interpretation of the passage in question. The Missouri Synod at one time desired to make it a principle and definition!

quotes merely prohibit a prying on our part into mysteries known only to God, notably the endeavor to ascertain which of the called will or will not believe. But that in a definition of the act of election the foreknowledge of God is to be left out as one of the factors to be considered, Huber will not be able to prove from the Book of Concord. For as Paul in Rom. 8, 29, deduces predestination from the foreknowledge of God, so also the Book of Concord mentions the foreknowledge of God in its definition of the act of God and deduces from it election, according to the example of Paul. His words read thus: 'God in His counsel, purpose and foreordination not only secured salvation in the abstract, but also graciously foreknows each and every person which is to be saved through Christ (clementer præscivit), elected to the laying hold of salvation, etc." (Page 112.)

"Huber simply rejects the particular election of believers which is explicitly taught in the Book of Concord by deductions from the Holy Scriptures. We consider all further discussion with him as fruitless, because he does not yield to the clear testimonies of Holy Scripture and the Book of Concord, even though he may not dare to contradict their letter. We have no hope of coming to an agreement with him in this or any other article, for the reasons mentioned." (Page 150.)

Huber had written: "The Book of Concord presupposes the grace of God and the merits of Christ as the complete cause of election (plane totalem)." The Wuertemberg theologians answered: "With these words Huber drops faith or the consideration of faith from the act of election and seeks, with bold insolence, to make the Book of Concord the panoply of his error, whereas the Book of Concord in declaring the merits of Christ and the grace of God to be the complete cause of election does not want to eliminate faith or the consideration of faith, but the merits of men. For as the decree of justification and salvation is not consummated (absolvitur) through the grace of God and the merits of Christ, but takes faith in as its completing link, thus the decree of election is not consummated without faith or the consideration of faith. Therefore the Book of Concord plainly states, that God has decreed that He would save no one except those who believe in Jesus Christ." (Page 182.) "We teach according to the Scriptures and the Book of Concord that it is one and the same act, one and the same decree of salvation, that God wills that all men should be saved by faith in

Jesus Christ. This act is not constituted of two elements, the grace of God and the merits of Christ, but of three, the grace of God, the merits of Christ, and the consideration of faith." (Page 198.)

Again and again the Wuertemberg theologians repeat that "the particular election of believers is taught both in the Bible and in the Book of Concord" (page 68), that "the doctrine and the term election of believers must not be dropped, since both matter and form are thus in agreement with the Holy Scriptures and the Book of Concord" (page 101); that "Huber's opinion of election, according to which he excludes the consideration of faith from the eternal act of God, is an overturning of the particular election of believers which is taught most plainly in the Scriptures and the Book of Concord" (page 110); that "Huber's universal election, from the definition of which the consideration of faith is left out as a constituent element, overturns the particular election of believers which the teaching of the Book of Concord establishes" (page 112); that "Huber flatly contradicts the Word of God and the Book of Concord by abandoning and excluding particular election" (page 161); that "the doctrine of election is not new, but agrees closely with the Holy Scriptures as well as the Book of Concord" (page 206), etc.

Such are the declarations of the theologians of Wittenberg, Rostock and Tuebingen concerning the right interpretation of the eleventh article and the question, whether the election taught in the Book of Concord refers to believers in Jesus as such or not. Such is the unanimous testimony of these foremost fathers of the Formula of Concord concerning the definition which the original Church of the Formula of Concord recognized as her own and found clearly and emphatically expressed in her Confession received only a short time previously.

The Calvinists said: "God has elected certain particular persons, but not in the foreknowledge or consideration of foreseen faith." The fathers of the Formula of Concord replied: "Truly, God has elected certain particular persons, but not according to a mere absolute pleasure, but according to the order of His revealed will: 'Whosoever believeth shall be saved,' a decree which has reference to foreseen believers. This is taught in the Scriptures and this is the doctrine contained in our Book of Concord."

Huber said: "God has loved all men, and therefore elected

all men to salvation irrespective of faith." The fathers reply: "Truly, God has loved all men and earnestly desires according to His antecedent will that all may come to faith and be saved; but election or the absolute decree of the salvation of certain persons in preference to others (prae caeteris) embraces only those who truly repent and apprehend and receive Christ in true faith, wherefore only foreseen unbelief excludes any one from such election."

Huber as well as the Calvinists emphasize, that no consideration of foreseen faith or unbelief has in the scale of God's judgment determined the decrees of election or reprobation, and that the elect have received the blessing of election not through the foresight of future faith. But the fathers of the Formula of Concord emphasize over against both again and again that election to salvation is inseparable from the apprehension of the merits of Christ in faith, and dependent upon the same.

"Particular election of believers," that is the definition of the Book of Concord according to the testimonies of these fathers of Rostock, Wittenberg and Wuertemberg, testimonies unanimous and incessantly repeated. They not merely drop incidentally at one time and another an utterance that might be interpreted according to the definition above given, but "ex professo" they make the "particular election of believers" the chief theme of their discussions on predestination against the Calvinists as well as against Huber. Nor do they mention to Huber the Book of Concord incidentally, but advisedly they point with their fingers to chief passages like these: "God has decreed from eternity to receive unto grace, adoption and the inheritance of eternal life all those who in true repentance and faith would apprehend Jesus Christ, and God has decreed in His eternal counsel to save no one except believers in Jesus Christ." "Here it is clearly and plainly taught in the Book of Concord," the fathers declare times innumerable, "not that God, in His decree of election, has had regard to nothing or has set apart for salvation certain persons without any consideration of foreseen faith, but that, on the contrary, He has had careful regard to the question, which among the number of the called would let themselves be brought to faith and kept in faith through the operation of the Holy Ghost, who can be resisted by all men, even the elect. Within the confines of the order established by God, namely repentance, and the resistibility of the grace of God

on the part of all men, even of the elect, the final election of persons to unfailing salvation has been consummated in view of faith. It extends from the beginning of the world to the end thereof to all men, not, however, like the universal love of God, nor does it hover over some particular persons as an unrevealed mystery, surrounded by impenetrable darkness, but it is the election of foreseen believers, "clearly revealed in the Gospel." In so far eternal election has been clearly revealed in the Gospel and the Book of Life unfolded to the gaze of the whole world. Therefore we must hold fast to it as a fundamental article of the true faith and orthodox confession that election to life embraces future believers as such and has been consummated from the standpoint of the merits of Christ apprehended in faith. "Particular election of believers" is the weighty definition of Lutheran orthodoxy, if those fathers of the Formula of Concord rightly understood and interpreted the Confession. All objections of Huber to this definition as contained in the Book of Concord, are refuted already by the fathers so thoroughly and conclusively that all the chief arguments of our Missourian friends in favor of their Huberian-Calvinistic definition ("irrespective of faith") have been condemned by those venerable fathers of the Formula of Concord as inconclusive and untenable.

We rightfully ask the question: Did not the theologians of Rostock, of Wittenberg, of Tuebingen know the Lutheran definition of election? Did they not know, if such had been the case, that other Lutheran churches and universities considered quite a different definition as scriptural and symbolical?

If there had been a third party in the Lutheran Church which had found neither Huber's definition, nor that of the fathers of Rostock, Wittenberg and Tuebingen taught in the Scriptures and confessed in the Book of Concord, this third party would have been heard from! The duty of speaking out would have been so much more imperative in the face of the fact, that three prominent Lutheran universities and pillars of orthodoxy, Rostock, Wittenberg and Tuebingen, had departed so soon and abominably from Scripture and Symbol, while the rest of the Church held fast to the symbolical definition of election! Of the eight thousand fathers of the Formula of Concord surely one-half were living at this time. Of these the one or the other should have bestirred himself bravely and placed the question of the right definition of election and the correct interpretation of the Formula

of Concord into the right light! If there had been in existence at that time representatives of the Missourian definition of election who were of any account, they should have said to Huber: You are right in denying that the consideration of faith is postulated in the elective decree, but you are on the wrong road, when you extend the elective decree to all men. To the theologians of Rostock, Wittenberg, and Tuebingen these representatives of the Missourian definition of election should have spoken: You are right when you claim that the Book of Concord teaches a particular election, but how can you so depart from Scripture and Symbol as to make the consideration of faith a constituent part of your definition and render the decree of election dependent upon foreseen faith, since the Formula of Concord brands this 'election of believers' as terrible, blasphemous and not to be tolerated in the Church! To both they should have said: What you reject in the definition of the Calvinists is its essential part! But not one is heard from! Among the thousands of the fathers of the Formula of Concord then living and working in the enjoyment of their full mental power, not one was heard to say: "What? 'particular election of believers' is to be the definition of the eleventh article? Since when has this transmutation taken place? Fifteen years ago, and ever since, the Church has found quite a different definition of election in the Confession, namely the election of particular persons irrespective of faith," etc.

Strange, passing strange! What sort of a Church was that which permitted, as soon as the first attempt was made, an alien definition of election to be foisted upon it, without stirring a finger to resist? Oh, if Missouri had only a few witnesses, only a few faithful witnesses of that time, who after the adoption of the eleventh article had declared in unambiguous language that the Formula of Concord had not established the particular election of believers as the orthodox definition of election. If only one or the other of those theologians of acknowledged orthodoxy and of the fathers of the Formula of Concord had entered a protest, so that an appeal could be taken to him, and it could be said: That faithful man stood in a time of general apostasy like a wall and testified: Huber trifles with his universal election, but the men of Rostock, Wittenberg and Tuebingen trifle also with their particular election of believers, or their election in view of faith, for what they consider a revelation of election in the Gospel is not election at all, but merely a part of the universal order of salvation," etc. But

no one, no one of those who in the outset had signed and advocated the Formula of Concord—and thousands were yet living—made himself heard and sounded forth the Missourian (N. B. Calvinistic) definition of election as that of the Symbol. All take their stand with the men of Wittenberg and Tuebingen and testify with one accord: Election of believers is the definition of the Book of Concord. Such is every declaration, every testimony of those faithful fathers of the Formula of Concord. Not one knows aught else. And notwithstanding all this their definition is not to be looked upon by us as that of the Church of the Formula of Concord nor of the Book of Concord over against the Calvinistic and Huberian definitions?

Has there ever been a symbol which has been so treated? There has been composed an eleventh article in the Epitome and Declaratio, which has been signed by no fewer than eight thousand theologians as their confession of faith in hundreds of larger and smaller countries and cities all over Germany. A few years later an ugly controversy arises on account of this eleventh article. Some vagrant, one Huber, opines that there is found in the Book of Concord an "election without the consideration of faith." All over Germany fathers of the Formula of Concord arise in multitude, who one after the other testify: "The definition of election which is found in the Book of Concord, is not an election according to the mere pleasure of God and without regard to faith, but an election of believers in Christ or an election according to the foreknowledge of future faith." All the fathers of the Formula of Concord who take a part in the controversy, joyfully agree and confirm that the definition of election contained in the Book of Concord does not embrace sinners without faith as such, neither all according to Huber, nor some, according to the Calvinists, but only future believers as such. The whole Lutheran Church is a unit with respect to this point since the adoption of the Formula of Concord; and whereas already since the year 1580 testimonies occur in plenty which find the election of believers taught in the Book of Concord, there is not a single statement by any prominent theologian or father of the Formula of Concord which finds in the Symbol adopted by the Church the definition of the Missourians: election irrespective of faith! This curious discovery was reserved for our enlightened nineteenth century. Or can St. Louis drag forth a single declaration relative to the definition of election given in

the Book of Concord? Can St. Louis name a single theologian who has claimed, that this is the definition of election as found in the Book of Concord: Particular election of certain persons without regard to faith? Let St. Louis name such a father of the Formula of Concord! We have summoned many of them as witnesses for our side. If Missouri has counter-witnesses with reference to this point, they should not remain voiceless. Let it name the fathers of the Formula of Concord to us, who have made utterances on the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord and found the Missourian definition in the same. The contrast between Calvinism and Huberianism furnished sufficient opportunity to make declarations on the definition of election as found in Scripture and Symbol. If the original Church of the Formula of Concord had understood its eleventh article in the sense of the Missourians, and recognized the Missourian definition as orthodox, it would have been impossible that twelve years later the whole Church should either have forgotten or treated with indifference the correct interpretation of the Confession and the orthodox definition!

The question at issue is one of honesty and love of historical truth. Whoever believes the election of believers to be a false conception of the doctrine of election, is at liberty to prove his opinion from the Scriptures. We Lutherans shall be ready for the fray also when waged on this line. But as regards the definition of election as furnished by the Symbol of the Church, there are extant testimonies and documents concerning the authentic definition of the very Church that had adopted the Confession and made it her own. This direct, authentic interpretation of the original fathers of the Formula of Concord cannot be misunderstood or misconstrued. A person may like it or not, may find it strange or not, but there is no room for doubt. The question is: 1. Whether the fact shall be looked honestly in the face or not, particularly whether Missouri has the honesty to do this; 2. Whether in spite of the historical fact of this authentic definition the claim shall continue to be made that the Church had a different definition of election from what the fathers claim she had and expressed in the Book of Concord; 3. If the Church at that time found generally that definition in the Symbol which the theologians of Rostock, Wittenberg and Wuertemberg maintained and advocated over against Huber as that of the Symbol, whether it is honest, notwithstanding this fact,

to interpret the Symbol differently and to accuse those who interpret it as did these fathers of the Formula of Concord, with a departure from the symbolical definition. Let Missouri answer!

But it will probably make silence the chief weapon of its strategy. It will pass over in silence the historical and authentic interpretation of the eleventh article, as it is found, explicitly and clearly, in the documents and has now been brought to the light of day. It must admit to itself that the voice of these theologians of Rostock, Wittenberg and Tuebingen, Leipzig and Marburg was not a private utterance in discord with the universal faith of the Church, but the true voice of the original Church of the Formula of Concord. This consciousness Missouri will have in its bosom, but Missouri will take care not to admit it, as honesty requires. It will take care not to say publicly: "The fathers of the Formula of Concord have, it must be admitted, bequeathed to posterity the authentic declaration that this is the definition of the Formula of Concord: God has elected to salvation foreknown believers in Christ." St. Louis would be compelled first to become honest in this matter and abandon its vain glory as a Reformer. This it will not do and hence its only answer to the authentic interpretation of the fathers is SILENCE!

PART III.

IS THE DOCTRINE THAT GOD HAS ELECTED MEN TO SALVATION IN VIEW OF FAITH FOUND IN OUR LUTHERAN CONFESSION?

I.

We answer: Yes, it is found therein. Missouri answers: No, it is not found therein, but the opposite doctrine that God has elected to salvation sinners as such.

It is granted that the question as formulated by us, does not determine, whether answered in the negative or affirmative, the truth and divine origin of the doctrine in question. These can be established only by an appeal to Scripture. It would be papistic sophistry to make a syllogism like the following the basis of our doctrinal position: All doctrines contained in the Evangelical Lutheran Confessions are unquestionably of divine origin; the doctrine that particular election to salvation embraces only believers is contained in the Lutheran Confession; therefore also this doctrine, like all other Lutheran-symbolical doctrines, is divine truth. Such argumentation would be worthy of Rome.

But when the question is raised, whether a certain doctrine is confessed in the Lutheran Church, the decision depends on the Confession. This is now the issue between us and Missouri. If Missouri should desire to leave this article out of consideration and take its stand against us Lutherans only on the basis of the Scriptures, no one would offer the slightest objection. But as long as it makes the Confession its point of vantage and claims for its alien doctrine symbolical dignity and home privileges in our Church, it must permit others to subject such claims to a thorough historical investigation.

Since the Lutheran Church has had her Book of Concord, the doctrine, that God has set apart for eternal life believers in Christ or that election has taken place in view of faith, has been recognized as distinctively Lutheran by friend and foe. Missouri itself is authority for the fact that the dogmaticians

of our Church have recognized this doctrine as the doctrine of their Church and that they have come to its defense both against Calvinist and papist. The force of this historical fact they seek to evade by setting up the claim that these "Intuitu Fidei theologians" have departed from Scripture and Symbol. For years the massive proof has accumulated that the Church of the Formula of Concord understood, in precisely the same manner throughout, the Confession approved and signed by her, and particularly this eleventh article. This fact is of the utmost importance in securing a correct interpretation of the eleventh article. The Church which adopts and approves a Confession, has the unquestioned right of furnishing an authentic interpretation of the same. The attempt, now after three centuries, to find a sense in the Confession which is diametrically opposed to that which the Church herself found in her symbol, according to her own unanimous testimony, and which has been set forth and confessed as her faith, is a proceeding so ridiculous as to be worthy only of a prestidigitator or of a Crypto-Calvinist. That merely for lack of time no attention is paid to the authentic interpretation of the Confession which the hand of history has brought out clearly, our opponents do not expect us to believe. There are other causes for their assiduous silence relative to the testimony of history, while the true issue is clouded by their clamorous appeals to Scripture.

Why is not our challenge accepted to show that the original Church of the Formula of Concord did not find an election of believers at all in the Confession, or that she departed from the Symbol on which she had just stamped her approval? From our standpoint the affair is devoid of difficulty. The mere assumption that the later Lutheran Church has been in a state of uncertainty about a question of such far-reaching consequences, and which for years had been tried in the crucible of controversy; that the Church, furthermore, should have assailed, at least in one important point, the doctrine of the Symbol and defended a doctrine branded in the Symbol itself as blasphemous — the mere assumption itself lacks the feeble strength of probability. But when the evidence is brought that the Church of the Formula of Concord had essentially the same understanding of the Confession as the later Church, and when the testimonies containing this evidence are characterized by such clearness of statement and unanimity of endorsement as to remove the authen-

tic interpretation of the Church of that time completely from the sphere of uncertainty and speculation, can it still be possible to maintain in all sincerity that only the later theologians, denounced as "Intuitu Fidei theologians," have departed from the Confession, inasmuch as their definition is alleged to differ widely from that of the original fathers?

No, gentlemen, the doctrine of election which the later dogmaticians maintained and defended as pure doctrine the fathers themselves found in the Symbol when they, in the year 1580, presented it to all the world with eight thousand signatures affixed to it. This they have told us themselves in hundreds of writings. And yet this doctrine is not to be found in the Symbol but the one opposed to it? Not the Lutheran defense of the Intuitu Fidei but the Calvinistic perversion of it is to be buttressed by the Formula of Concord? Oh, has there ever been a church suffering from such a visitation? But, we hear the objection murmured, where is the Intuitu Fidei found in the Symbol? We may read the Confession as often as we please and not a syllable of such an expression do we find on its pages. What a stratagem! Simply because this or similar expressions used by the dogmaticians and fathers of the Church is not found in the Symbol, the doctrine itself, we are told, can not be found in it either. What would become of our Lutheran Church, what of our Christian Church, if we should compare our ecumenical and Lutheran Confessions with the Scriptures and apply the rule: If such and such expressions are not found in the Scriptures, the doctrine they clothe is not scriptural? Such a principle would give Missouri an opportunity for a reformation still more sweeping, for many a doctrine known by a name not of scriptural but of historical and dogmatical origin, such as "Trinity," "Original Sin," "Means of Grace" and others, would be swept by such a pseudo-reformation out of the Church.

Let us go back a few years and consider, in what manner Missouri defended its doctrines of the invisible church and the ministerial office. Were the terms Missouri thought necessary to use for the establishment of its doctrine found in the Confession? Or did Missouri at that time recognize the principle that no doctrine could be scriptural as long as the terms in which it is set forth are not found in Scripture? Where in the Bible do we find the terms: "Invisible Church," or "Transfer of the Ministerial Office from the Congregation to the

Individual"? No, at that time this principle was vicious and could not be accorded recognition, for what would have become of Missouri, if the absence of the terms from the Symbol were tantamount to a symbolical anathema of the conception which the terms were intended to clothe? But to-day the wind is blowing from a different quarter, so that the "Wachende Kirche" also, the official organ of the Buffalo Synod, now holds the mirror up before the face of Missouri and says: O how much you have become like Buffalo in occupying the same standpoint that we always have maintained but you have been pleased to assail; we are glad that you now heartily agree with us in principle; let us hope that you will soon agree with us in the application of this principle to the doctrines still mooted between our respective synods, as we are practically agreed in its application to the Intuitu Fidei.

Well, we opponents of Misouri shall not be dismayed nor led astray by such Neo-Missourian pranks. We readily admit: The expression Intuitu Fidei is not found in the Symbol, but the matter which has received in this expression its churchly and dogmatical label, stands out clearly in our Book of Concord. True, such proof ought not to be necessary at all for Lutherans, they should know what has been accepted as a matter of fact ever since the adoption of the Book of Concord three hundred years ago is a historic verity. We rather fear that Lutherans who do not find this doctrine in the Book of Concord are unsuccessful in their quest not because they can not, but because they refuse to find it. But in order to be remiss in no part of our undertaking, we shall show where, how, and why we find, in common with the fathers of the Formula of Concord and the "later dogmaticians," this doctrine taught in the Book of Concord with absolute clearness, that God has elected believers as such to eternal life, not as we have already admitted, through the medium the theological terms in which this doctrine has become familiar to us, but in substance. That we lean upon the testimonies of the original signers of the Formula of Concord and furnish, in the main, no other arguments than those used for the same purpose by the original authors and signers of the Book of Concord, will not be made a charge against us by men of probity and justice.

II.

When, in the following pages, we seek to prove that the doctrine which, in the expression, "Election has taken place intuitu fidei," has become the shibboleth of the Church, is, in substance, found in the Book of Concord, we have in mind pre-eminently the decree of God regarding our salvation. We are well aware that the form of doctrine or mode of presentation (tropos paideias) has not always been the same in our Church; we also admit that there are differences of form even among theologians of the same epoch. We are of the opinion, however, that we have neither call nor inclination to write a historical treatise of the progress and the changes which the formal development of this doctrine exhibits. The circumscribed condition of both means and talents suggests the limitation of our energy to the important chief question, whether the Lutheran Confession, in keeping with the teaching of our dogmaticians, makes the final decree of salvation dependent upon foreseen faith in Christ, or whether it is confined to the hidden will and absolute purpose of God, so that no difference entered into consideration (even as to foreseen faith or unbelief) between those who were elected and those who failed of election, but merely a libitum, a good pleasure, or choice of God.

This very point is the radical difference between the doctrine of election in view of faith (i. e. in view of the merits of Christ apprehended by faith) and the doctrine of an unconditional, arbitrary election. God has ordained the elect to eternal life according to an ordinate will, therefore He has considered not only His mercy and the merits of Christ, but at the same time the order of repentance and faith, nor has He neglected to consider what sinners, in the order established for all, namely repentance and faith, avail themselves, through the gracious operation of the Holy Ghost, of the saving merits of Christ, and what sinners resist such operation.

In this the parties to the controversy are agreed that God's will to save sinners is both universal and particular. Both sides of His will are clearly taught in the Scriptures: 1) "God wills that all men should be saved"; 2) "Few are chosen." The question now is, whether the universal will and this particular decree are to be taken as moving along parallel lines incapable of converging, separated by an impassable chasm, by an insoluble, mys-

terious difference, yea contradiction. Or whether the mystery of election has not been explained in the Word so far as to furnish us an article of faith. Such an article of faith we have. It is this: "Between the universal will of God, which embraces all men, and the particular, final decree of salvation there exist, as the connecting link, according to the order of salvation established for all, foreseen repentance and faith in Christ. These form the revealed bridge over the gulf, in many respects still full of mystery. They mediate between the universal will of God and the particular election of individuals, relatively few in number, to the certain attainment of salvation. But Missouri alleges that Scripture and Confession know nothing of God's foreknowledge of repentance and faith as being in a measure a key to the particular decree of election and a subordinate element in the universal purpose of His grace. A doctrine that places repentance and faith between the universal will and the decree of election is alleged, by mediating between the mystery of election and reason, to dissolve the former so that everything mysterious is taken away from the act of election. According to the provisions of election this act of God is claimed to be primarily the setting apart of certain particular sinners to salvation and the attainment of eternal life, and secondarily the setting apart of the same persons for all the means necessary to the attainment of the blessings of salvation, so as to include all things that secure to the subjects of election the salvation for which they have been singled out. Scripture and Confession teach, according to Missouri, that election is on this account an unfailing and in all cases definite ordination unto faith, repentance, and steadfastness, just because it is in its relation to man utterly without qualification and condition. Even the appropriation of the merits of Christ, or the merits of Christ appropriated in faith, are not recognized as a connecting link between the universal will of God and the decree of salvation which embraces only a small number, but are considered merely as the fruit and result of a decree embracing exclusively the elect.

Such a doctrine, we confess, we cannot discover either in Scripture or Confession. It is incomprehensible to us that a person who reads either book without bias, does not everywhere find the opposite doctrine. For what does the gospel do but announce to men that God desires the salvation of all men through the provision established by Him, viz. repentance and

faith; on the other hand also to declare that it depends on the faith and repentance of those who are called whether God has decreed their salvation or not? Therefore it is written clearly and simply: "Go and preach the Gospel to every creature." (Here the universal will of God is revealed and also the universal means of grace, viz. the Gospel, from the preaching and hearing of which saving faith can come to all.) 2) "He who believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he who believeth not, shall be damned." (Here the particular decree of salvation which covers only a few persons is revealed as depending upon faith in the Gospel, so that every one who believeth, according to God's will and decree, is surely one who shall be saved and besides these no one else.) As far as the universal will of God is concerned, He desires the salvation of all men through faith; He desires to bring all men to faith through the Gospel, because He sincerely desires the salvation of them all. But as regards the particular decree of saving certain persons, it postulates, acording to the purpose of God and the general order of salvation, faith in Christ, and demands the same as the condition. Whoever can not read this in the Gospel, is surely stricken with blindness. And our Lutheran Confession says the same so faithfully and decisively that it is both ridiculous and sad when a person can not see the woods for the multitude of trees. What if our Confession does speak of election or predestination in a wider or even widest sense; what if besides the final decree of salvation this or that is included in the conception of election? This much is always certain, the Confession never makes the decree that sets men apart for divine adoption and inheritance embrace sinners without faith, but always sinners who have repented and come to faith. Election, therefore, according to the Confession, is dependent upon repentance and faith according to the foreknowledge of God. According to the revealed order of salvation it is required of a sinner that he be a believer in Christ before he can be received among the number of elect children and heirs. Is not this intended to be taught by the apostle when he writes: "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them who believe in His name"? (John 1, 12.)

The effort appears to us almost ludicrous to prove to a Lutheran from the standpoint of our Confession that this and nothing else is found in our Confession. This and nothing

else the Church which has received the Confession, in common with the whole Church since that time, has confessed as her own and defended against the Calvinists. And how can an Evangelical Lutheran Church teach otherwise in view of what she teaches concerning justification by faith? She teaches that God desires to justify and save all men, and, therefore, to bring them to faith in Jesus, but that the question, which particular sinners are to be justified, and which are not, is decided in God's will strictly according to the attitude which the called assume towards the merits of Jesus Christ. First faith, then the decision: This sinner shall unfailingly be justified for the sake of Christ. As far as we know, not even Missouri has dared to let the act of justification, according to logical sequence, precede faith, or to present it as having been passed upon unbelieving sinners. And as long as the act of justification is dependent upon foreseen faith, the truth shall, nolens volens, be permitted to stand, that the final decree of salvation also postulates foreseen faith in the same sense and for the same reason. Only a man of confused mind would dare to affirm: God has not decreed concerning this or that sinner, "he shall be justified for Christ's sake," before He saw that he would appropriate the merits of Christ; but God has notwithstanding decreed: "This and that sinner shall surely be saved before he looked for faith or, in the least, concerned Himself about the appropriation of the merits of Christ."

But let us assign the chief reasons why the doctrine that the final decree of salvation covers believers as such, is found in the Confession. We draw our arguments in the first place from the fundamental Confession, the Augustana, and the Apology to the same, and secondly from the Formula of Concord.

I. The Augsburg Confession informs us: "Thus also the fathers of the Church teach. For Ambrose saith: 'Thus it hath been ordained by God that whoso believeth in Christ, shall be saved.'"

Our fundamental Confession speaks explicitly of the divine decree of salvation. From this one decree of salvation recognized by Scripture and Confession, proceeds the rule of election: "Whosoever believeth in Christ shall be saved and no other." Missouri will here resort to her favorite subterfuge and say: Not a syllable is said here of election; justification according to the universal will of God is the topic under consideration. But we gratefully decline to accept the tenet, to which Missourian wisdom

has given birth, that God has formed two decrees of salvation contradictory to each other, namely, in the first place, the one proceeding from His universal will, which is to this effect: "Thus God has determined by Himself, that whosoever believeth in Christ shall be saved," and in the second place, another proceeding from the election of grace, which is to this effect: "Whosoever among sinners amid the common multitude shall be saved according of God's free purpose, he shall and must come to faith and persevere therein." Scripture and Confession know nothing of this double, self-contradictory decree of salvation. This unharmonized duplicity of the divine purpose of divine grace is an antiscriptural Missourian invention, but entirely in keeping with the new reformatory theology which thrives on contradictions and absurdities. The genuine reformers of the sixteenth century were not such fools. If they presented, in the sixth article of the Augustana, this as the faith, doctrine and confession of the Evangelical Church that the decree of God in reference to the subjects of salvation necessarily presupposed faith, they did not establish in the article of election a doctrine irreconcilable with the former, but clung to what had been confessed already in the Augustana, and said: "In Christ we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who has decreed in His eternal divine counsel that He would save no one except those who truly acknowledge His Son Jesus Christ and believe in Him." Manifestly the selfsame decree of salvation is under discussion here as that of which the Augustana had predicted the same thing.

Whether Ambrose is the author of the testimony above quoted or not, does not matter. The Symbol makes this statement its own confession: That it has been ordained by God, or as the Latin version has it: Hoc constitutum est a deo, i. e. this has been laid down by God, has been made the constitution, as it were, of His kingdom of grace, "that he who believes in Christ shall be saved." In this manner God has revealed His eternal purpose, counsel and will, for instance in passages like John 3, 16; 6, 40, of which the Formula of Concord expressly declares that Christ "proclaims in them the eternal election of the Father." The gracious will of God is not one in election and another in justification, but always one and the same gracious will which God has for all. Just as God has ordained in eternity, so also and in no other way the provisions of His plan are carried out in time, and vice versa. Plan and execution are not the same but the will

of God is the same in both. Moreover the Word 'ordained' points back to the eternal counsel of grace concerning all men: "Whosoever believeth, shall be saved." That God has made another decree whose provisions clash with those of the former, according to which certain sinners have been ordained to salvation without regard to faith is thereby excluded as a doctrine both false and unsymbolical. Under the direction of Holy Scripture it will soon be found who has been elected and ordained to eternal life. It is eternally certain that ordination to salvation in Christ means the same as to decree in the divine counsel to save in Christ. This no true Christian can deny. "Let a person therefore search in the Scriptures who they are whom God in eternity has determined to save, and he will know who is ordained and elected to eternal life." (Hunnius, Widerlegung der Vorrede Huber's — Refutation of Huber's Preface, p. 21.) This eternal and only decree is the issue between the Missourians and the Lutherans loyal to the Confession. The question is: 1. Are there, according to the teaching of Scripture, two decrees in reference to salvation which are, moreover, diametrically opposed to each other, the one saying, "Only believing sinners shall be ordained to eternal life," and the other,"Certain sinners without faith shall be ordained to salvation and incidentally to faith"? And 2. If there is only one decree of salvation, has foreseen faith been a condition and postulate of the same, or has God ordained and elected to salvation a few unregenerate sinners from the common aggregate absolutely irrespective of faith? The Confession answers: "It has been ordained by God, that whosoever believeth in Christ shall be saved."

II. The Apology. The Augustana having pointed out the decree, made in eternity, which promises and seals salvation only to those sinners who believe in Christ, the Apology carries the same thought out more fully. (Cf. Mueller, pp. 143, 144; Phila. ed. p. 116 and 151.) The truth is there set forth that we obtain salvation alone by the grace of God, not by the merit of our works. If God's grace is universal, as the Lutherans contended, the objection readily suggested itself to the papists: "You teach that all men are saved, for you teach that we are saved alone by divine grace and in the second place that this saving grace extends to all, while on the side of humanity there is no difference, since all are lost under sin and the curse of God, and any merit is out of the question." Somewhere, the papists con-

tended, there must be a difference between those who shall be saved, according to God's gracious will, and those who, according to the revealed Word and will of God, shall not and therefore cannot, be partakers of salvation. This objection the Apology quotes in the following words: "Here they will say: 'If we are saved by grace alone, what is the difference between those who are saved and those who are not saved? If merit is not taken into account, there is no difference between the evil and the just, and it follows that all without distinction are saved.' This argument has induced the scholastics to invent the 'meritum condigni' (merit of worthiness), for 'there must be a difference between those who are saved and those who are damned.' "

What reply does the Apology make to this objection of the papists? Does it flatly reject the proposition that there must be a difference between those who are saved and those who are damned? Does it simply refer to the word: "Therefore He hath mercy on whom He will have mercy and whom He will, He hardeneth," as directly applicable to those lying in the same perdition and bringing about the 'difference' between them? This solution would have been very easy, if the author of the Apology had reasoned after the manner of a Calvinist or Missourian concerning the divine decree of salvation. For Missouri, too, makes the final decree of salvation operative among the aggregate of men languishing in a common doom, and before a difference could be conceived. While God foresaw all sinners as lying, without difference, in the same condition of perdition and condemnation, He has extended His election unto salvation only to a few and ordained them at the same time unto all the means necessary for salvation! This unconditional election unto salvation and unto the means has secured for the elect the certainty of salvation. And secured it only for these few! The results of the contract of divine grace with the human heart have not been considered, but according to His free, unconditional, arbitrary, mysterious 'hidden purpose' He has had mercy only upon a few particular persons, from among the whole mass of condemned humanity, so that they alone with certainty attain salvation. So Missouri teaches. The objection first raised by the papists: "There must be a difference between those who are saved and those who perish, has manifestly reference to the decreeing will of God respecting salvation and condemnation. The idea is: If there were no difference on the side of the human race, the will of God in determin-

ing the destiny of His human creatures would be the same toward all; God in His mercy would either save the whole promiscuous multitude, or He would, in His justice, let the whole multitude of men go to perdition. With Him there is no respect of persons. But we know that God neither saves nor condemns all sinners. There must, therefore, be a difference between the two classes explanatory of the difference in the decreeing will of God and in the concrete results determined by the same, namely the salvation of the one class and the reprobation of the other. If God ordains: This sinner shall surely be saved, but that sinner shall surely be condemned, there must be 'a difference' among men which conditions and demands as a logical finality this difference in the divine judgment — a judgment of grace on the one hand, a judgment of wrath on the other.

What now is the rejoinder of the Apology to the objection of the papists that God must see a difference among men when He saves one class of sinners (i. e. ordains their salvation) but does not save the other class (i. e. ordain their salvation). This proposition: "There must be a difference between those who partake and those who fail of salvation," the Confession does not reject as essentially and radically erroneous, but confirms the same as evangelical truth by stating in the following sentences 'the difference' which obtains between those who are saved and those who are lost, as revealed in the Scriptures. If God ordains the salvation of one sinner and not that of the other, He takes into account the existence of a revealed difference, but does not arbitrarily divide a promiscuous multitude into two classes by the fiat: "This sinner shall be saved, that sinner shall not be saved." In other words, there must exist a difference separating sinners into two unequal classes, so that God, taking this difference and distinction into account, saves the one class and not the other (i. e. ordains the salvation of the one class and not that of the other). And what constitutes the difference which produces two classes of men in God's sight? "In the first place," we read, "eternal life belongs to those whom God justifies and when they have been justified, they are by that also God's children and co-heirs with Christ, as Paul says in his epistle to the Romans, 8, 30: 'Whom He justified them He also glorified.' Therefore no one is saved except those who believe the Gospel. But as our reconciliation with God would be uncertain, if it were based upon our works and not

upon God's gracious promise, which cannot fail, everything else would be uncertain for which we wait in hope, if it were built upon our merits and works. . . . As often as mercy is spoken of, faith in the promise must be added and this faith makes the distinction between those who are saved and those who are damned, between those who are worthy and those who are unworthy. For eternal life has been promised only to those who have been reconciled in Christ. But faith reconciles and justifies us before God, whenever we apprehend the promise by faith." (Phila. ed., p. 116 and 151.) (Haec fides facit discrimen inter hos, quibus contingit salus, et illos quibos non contingit. Fides facit discrimen inter dignos et indignos, quia vita eterna promisa est justificatis, fides autem justificat.)

Such is the reply of our Confession to the objection: "When God saves one class of men and not the other, there must be a difference between them which determines the difference in the divine verdict." The Confession replies: "Yes, certainly there is a difference and the difference, according to which God either saves or condemns, has been clearly revealed at that: it is faith in Jesus Christ, "that makes the difference before God," so that He ordains to certain justification and salvation all those that believe, but on the other hand neither saves nor ordains the salvation of those who do not believe. This is the great irrefragable truth that the Confession has already established in the Augustana: "Thus it has been ordained by God that whosoever believeth in Christ, shall be saved." Occupying this firm position as the revealed central truth of the whole Gospel and the doctrine of predestination, which is a constituent part thereof, the Lutheran Church in her Formula of Concord and the dogmatical and polemical developments of the evangelical doctrine of predestination taught by our Confession, has time and again emphasized and repeated: "Eternal life belongs to those whom God justifies, and when they are justified, they are by that also God's children and co-heirs with Christ, as Paul says in his epistle to the Romans, 8, 30: 'Whom He justified them He also glorified.' Therefore no one is saved except those who believe the Gospel."

"This faith makes the difference between those who are saved and those who are damned, between those who are worthy*

* When the term worthy is used here, it is not to be understood, as if the subjective act of appropriating the merits of Christ conferred saving worthiness, but in the sense that the vicarious merits of Christ, which

and those who are unworthy. For eternal life has been promised only to those who have been reconciled in Jesus Christ. But faith reconciles and justifies before God, whenever we apprehend the promise by faith."

Thus the individual parts or links of the chain of salvation hang together in a firm, indissoluble order. Yet the sequence is not this: 1) Decree of salvation for some sinners; 2) Decree imparting adoption and inheritance; 3) Decree of justification for the same persons; 4) Decree of conversion for the same. But this is the order according to the divine arrangement and presentation: 1) Proclamation of the mercy of God for all sinners on account of Christ; 2) Bestowal of such mercy and the merits of Christ upon faith; 3) Decree of justification and salvation passed upon such believers, i. e. singling out the same as children of God and co-heirs of Christ. Through faith righteousness, through righteousness adoption, through adoption the inheritance of eternal life. Therefore the difference in the eternal purpose of God (purpose to save on the one hand, purpose to condemn on the other) is to be traced back to the difference between sinners (believers and non-believers). And according to the revealed Gospel we must stop at faith as the proximate differentiating factor which conditions the bestowal of adoption and inheritance. We dare not, with Calvin and Missouri, let the decree whereby the divine adoption and inheritance are conferred upon the individual take precedence of foreseen faith in Jesus, thus making faith a mere subordinate and executive element emanating from the former. No; as the Gospel reveals to us the order of things in the counsel of God, there can be no question of a predestinative decree for the bestowal of justification, adoption, and inheritance, except upon the presumption that the merits of Christ have been apprehended in faith. As regards the sure application of the blessings of salvation secured by Christ, the order is the same for all men at all times: Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be justified, a child of God and an heir of eternal life, and finally of glory. No unconditional will or free purpose of God, but faith, "makes the difference"— in time as well as in eternity, before the foundation of the world was laid,

---

alone constitute the worthiness or righteousness which avails before God, are imputed, given and sealed alone unto faith. Not the subjective act of faith but the objective merits of Christ imputed to faith makes the unworthy worthy, and the ungodly just.

when the eternal decree was made regarding the salvation of particular persons.

"That is just the question," Missouri here interposes, "for when the execution of the eternal purpose in time is considered, the order surely is this: "Faith, justification, adoption, inheritance of eternal life; but when the eternal purpose is considered, election to salvation and all intermediate stages are to be conceived as a unit and as having taken place without regard to anything intervening. The Apology speaks only of the execution of the decree of election, in which God's will exhibits itself thus: "He who believes shall be justified, adopted as a child and heir and become a partaker of salvation." It does not treat of election, in which God's will is exhibited thus: "Whatever individuals among the common multitude (without regard to their repentance and faith) are infallibly ordained and predestined to salvation, are by the same act unfailingly elected also to conversion, faith, justification, adoption, inheritance of eternal life, in short 'to the whole way.'" The Apology, in the quotation which has been adduced as proof contains nothing about election, predestination, foreordination; least of all do we read there that election unto salvation has taken place in view of future faith — intuitu prævisæ fidei.

This, in its way, is entirely correct and yet it is not at all germane to the point, nor does it alter, in the least, the firmly established fact which we urge.

Does Missouri seriously put forth the claim, that the conception of "election," "predestination," "intuitu fidei," etc. must always be expressed in so many letters and syllables whenever Scripture or Symbol are quoted in reference to the final decree of salvation? Let it apply this principle first of all to the Confession itself. For instance in the Epitome we find in paragraph 4 that John 10, 28 and Matt. 16, 18 treat of predestination or the eternal election of God and yet none of these words are found in the passages quoted. In the ninth paragraph Rom. 9, 32; Ez. 18, 23; 33, 11; 2 Pet. 3, 9; 1 John 2, 2 are quoted as conveying "the right meaning of predestination," yea as "conclusive testimonies"; and yet the words election and predestination are not found in these passages. A person may compare in the Sol. Declaratio, especially the paragraphs 28 and 65-67, from which, according to our Confession, another essential part of our doctrine of predestination is learned, and again not a word is there

found concerning "election or predestination." Has the Confession departed from itself, or is it altogether blind, that it does not know which are the 'sedes doctrinæ' of the doctrine of election, from which (among the three or twelve or twenty-nine or who knows how many that bear upon this doctrine) the "right meaning" of this article can be learned? And can Missouri carry out this principle in reference to other doctrines that the "letters" used as the title or connotative term must be in evidence in the passages of Scripture and of the Confession which are called upon for a decision, when a doctrine is in dispute? According to this principle, where in Scripture do we read anything of "sacraments," or "adiaphora," or original sin, etc? Where, even in the Symbols, do we see anything concerning the "transfer of the ministerial office" or the "invisible church"? With what success can a controversy meet, in which the combatants resort to stratagems like this!

In the meantime we take our stand upon the import of the testimonies in Scripture and Confession and the harmonious connection (analogy) of the one faith, which has been delivered to the saints. Where, therefore, in Scripture or Confession the order of the decree of election is treated, we find, in harmony with the same, also the order of the eternal purpose. The one is the mirror of the other. In the established order of the various stages of the way of salvation, as each proceeds from the preceding one and links itself to it, we see faithfully mirrored the order of the eternal purpose in the divine counsel. Whoever does not believe that the eternal purpose and its execution in time correspond to each other, may continue on his course and reform the whole revelation of the counsel of God. He will find out in due time, at what cost such reformation will be achieved.

The Apology, as we have seen, clearly sets forth that the salvation of one sinner and the condemnation of the other presupposes "a difference" between them. It is of no moment whether the Symbol speaks, at this place, of the act of predestination or of its execution. There must, there must, there must be a difference — and this difference is: Faith on the one hand and unbelief on the other! Why must there be a difference? Why does God ordain to salvation only those who receive Christ in faith and not the others? Why, it is God's will according to its execution. Correct. And as far as the act of volition, the decreeing will is concerned? "That is a different thing alto-

gether." Qui bene distinguit, bene docet. The distinction made by Missouri merits indeed the epithet "bene." God's will and God's will are said to be two different things according as the decree or its execution are considered. Now, in time, it is to be believed, professed and proclaimed that the justification and salvation of a poor sinner depend strictly upon faith in Jesus. But when we speak of the will of God in connection with the eternal purpose (election—predestination) it is to be believed, professed and proclaimed just as confidently that God has viewed and considered nothing — least of all faith or the appropriated merits of Christ — though He firmly resolved here to justify and hereafter to glorify this or that sinner! God's will, accordingly, is said to be quite different, as far as its announcement in the plan of salvation and its execution are concerned from what it is when the plan of salvation was laid down. Then He would not view faith for the purpose of adopting His children and heirs; but now He strictly and exclusively views faith and makes the adoption of His children and heirs dependent upon it. 'Yes' and 'no' can not more flatly contradict each other, more uncompromisingly oppose each other than these alleged two wills of God. In the eternal counsel the rule was: "Without previous regard to the appropriation of the merits of Christ through faith this and that sinner shall be elected and adopted to sonship and the inheritance of eternal life." In the execution, however, the rule obtains: "Eternal life is sealed to no one, except to those who have made peace with God through Christ." But faith reconciles us with God and secures the righteousness which avails before Him. This faith it is which makes "the differenece between those who are saved and those who are damned, the worthy and the unworthy." But how, according to Missouri's new reformatory wisdom, the will of God can, with respect to the same matter, be so widely different in the eternal purpose from what it has been revealed to be in the execution, how it can be so radically in contradiction with itself, well, that is another of those new and "wonderful mysteries."

There is a mystery in this doctrine. It is an incomprehensible mystery that men of sound mind can set up such nonsense as an article of faith. If they preach of the will of God, as it rules in time, they eagerly emphasize that God wills to justify and save no sinner, unless by faith he has apprehended the merits of Christ. Not merely upon the preparation but upon

the appropriation of the merits of Christ, it is said to depend, whether sinners are to be saved and justified and who these are. But when these gentlemen treat of the eternal counsel of election, in which God made the decree in reference to the salvation and justification of particular sinners, the foreknowledge of faith or the apprehended merits of Christ are alleged to have had no effect upon the decision, no regard, no consideration, no thought being vouchsafed to the same. These two statements can never be reconciled. They contradict each other, — and can we be expected to believe that the advocates of such drivel have been called to work out a reformation?

Missouri's ratiocination in reference to the elect appears to be the following: Before time began God elected and ordained this and that sinner to salvation and, at the same time, unto all means, especially unto faith. Faith, however, was at the making of the decree, not an essential element in the act of election but merely in the execution of the same. But now, in time, God reveals His will with respect to the same sinners quite differently, presenting it as demanding a prerequisite to salvation and justification, namely faith. Now we are told: "Without faith it is impossible to please God; Lord, Thy eyes look to faith; believe in the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be justified and saved," etc. First, God determines to save these, His elect, without considering or requiring faith; but afterward He reveals as His divine, unchangeable counsel and will, that they must believe before He can receive them as subjects of justification and salvation! For "thus God has decreed in His eternal counsel!"*

III.

The Formula of Concord. — Before we enter more closely upon the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord, in order to receive from it the right answer to the question propounded by us, a few preliminary remarks may not be amiss.

First of all a remark about the point at issue in view of the tribunal before which we plead the Confession. The point at issue is not, for the present, the doctrine contained in the

* Note of translator: The excellent translation of the Book of Concord by Dr. Jacobs is so much different from the German edition used by the author, at least as to form, that it has been found impossible uniformly to quote from this standard English edition.

Scriptures as the revealed truth of God, to which our faith is to cling and which, therefore, is to be received and held fast as an article of faith. The question, on the contrary, resolves itself into the historical consideration of the sense and import of our Confession in reference to a fundamental point of the doctrine of election. We are firmly convinced that the doctrine of our Lutheran Confession fully comports with the Holy Scriptures; that our Confession has drawn its doctrine only from the revealed Word, and, in consequence, teaches nothing else concerning the point at issue than what also the Holy Scriptures teach. But our purpose, at the present time, is not to test and prove whether the doctrine which is contained in our Confession and has been unanimously defended against the Calvinists by our Church, is really the one authorized by the Scriptures, and the opposite Calvinistic and Missourian doctrine really antiscriptural. Our aim is merely to demonstrate that our interpretation of the fundamental point, which is the cynosure of this protracted controversy, is warranted by and contained in the Confession, and identical with that of the later dogmaticians. The doctrine, as defined by the later dogmaticians, is, we admit, not expressed in the Confession in their identical phraseology, nor could that be expected, because the stage of doctrinal controversy at the time of the preparation and adoption of the Formula of Concord did not require the narrowing of the definition to such a fine point.

The important question to be decided is this: Has the decree of God which has been passed upon particular sinners among the common multitude, to the end of irrevocably ordaining and determining their exclusive restoration to grace, adoption, and inheritance of eternal life — has this decree been passed upon believers as such, or merely upon sinners without regard to foreseen future faith, i. e. upon sinners without faith? This decree conferring salvation, or adoption and inheritance is the primary object of the controversy between Missouri and ourselves. In so far, it is true, as Missouri operates with Calvinistic counter-arguments; for instance, when the contention is made that God converts man without regard to his conduct and gives him faith irrespective of his conduct, also the question of the nature of converting grace will be drawn into the controversy, as to whether it is really absolute, irresistible, unconditional and without a qualification. This question as to the nature and distinguishing characteristics of

saving and regenerating grace will become a secondary cause of division between ourselves and Missouri, inasmuch as Missouri would be forced to abandon its whole position, if it would come to recognize its fundamental error of an absolute, unconditional, arbitrary regenerating grace. But as the primary point in the controversy we can recognize only the question regarding the eternal purpose and decree relative to human salvation. Has God made His eternal decree conferring adoption and inheritance upon certain sinners, in distinction from others, depend upon their future faith? Or has He passed upon certain unregenerate sinner in Adam His elective decree including faith as the essential means of execution? In other words: Has God, as He, in time, by faith justifies and saves certain sinners in preference to others (præ cæteris), even so before time began elected particular sinners to adoption and inheritance, in distinction from others, through (foreseen) faith? Or has He, without previously considering faith, set apart for Himself from the common multitude, particular sinners without faith as children and heirs of eternal salvation; elected and ordained such sinners without faith to adoption and inheritance, and to faith merely as a means for executing His decree; therefore electing them, without regard to faith, unto adoption and inheritance and hence also unto faith, without regard to their personal conduct toward His grace which (as far as they are concerned) irresistibly works faith?

We affirm without hesitation: All Scripture testifies most clearly and positively that, according to the will of God as conceived in eternity, the adoption and inheritance of eternal life depends upon the merits of Christ as apprehended in faith. All those who, in faith, appropriate to themselves the merits of Christ, shall be received unto adoption and inheritance on account of these imputed merits of Christ, according to the immutable will of God—and besides these no one! Not one sinner who stands before the eyes of God as a sinner without faith, that means a sinner apart from Christ, a sinner who, at least thus far, has not appropriated to himself the merits of Christ—not one such sinner without faith, and just as long as he is considered as a mere sinner, shall be received unto grace, adoption and inheritance of eternal life, according to the will of God. The preparation of the merits of Christ is, beyond a doubt, intended for all men; Christ has secured His merits for all men with the intention that all, without exception, should be received unto grace, adoption

and the inheritance of eternal life. This saving grace, divine adoption and inheritance is, as far as the preparation is concerned, completely contained in the merits of Christ, without exception, distinction and variation as to degree and method. But the preparation alone is not sufficient when the actual personal adoption unto grace, sonship and inheritance is taken into consideration; otherwise all men would actually become children of God as surely as the title to sonship and inheritance has been procured for them. But according to God's immutable will the question of actual sonship and inheritance is decided by the apprehension of the merits of Christ through faith. This is the will of God in reference to this matter. God is not satisfied with the preparation alone, but He strictly looks to faith; He will give the power to become the sons of God only to those who receive His Son in faith. This passage sets forth an everlasting truth: "Without faith it is impossible to please God." Not only does God refuse to receive a single sinner without the merits prepared by Christ, unto sonship, and the inheritance of eternal life, but this preparation having taken place, He refuses to let such adoption take place without the merits of Christ being appropriated through faith. Nor is He willing to impute and transfer the title to grace, inheritance and sonship in spite of its preparation for all men, without this condition being met. Thus and not otherwise does God exercise His will according to the universal gracious counsel, which He has revealed to us. And besides this He has no other will, according to which the situation would change in behalf of however few; for God has no contradictory wills. (Formula of Concord, XI, 34: Hoc enim esset, Deo contradictorias voluntates affingere.) "God is faithful, having made known to us the mystery of His will" Eph. 1, 9): that all those who believe in His Son, and only these, shall, as believers, be restored to grace, sonship and the inheritance of eternal life. Not without faith or before faith, but with, in and through faith as the only means of appropriation, the merits of Christ, in which alone all grace, sonship and inheritance lies hidden as the wealth procured for us, shall, according to God's immutable counsel, believers in Christ individually be received and accepted to grace, sonship, and the inheritance of eternal life.

In harmony with the Augsburg Confession and the Apology of the same, the Formula of Concord, in the third article, "Of the Righteousness of Faith before God," corroborates repeatedly

the doctrine, that according to the will of God, as clearly revealed in the Gospel, righteousness, sonship and inheritance depend not only upon the merits of Christ as secured and still unappropriated, but as apprehended and laid hold of. The principal subject of the above named article is expressed in the words of the Formula of Concord (Phila. Ed., p. 501): "Therefore we believe, teach and confess that our righteousness before God is, that God forgives us our sins out of pure grace, without any merit, work or worthiness of ours preceding, attending or following, for He presents and imputes to us the righteousness of Christ's obedience, on acocunt of which righteousness we are received into grace by God and regarded righteous. We believe, teach and confess that faith alone is the means and instrument whereby we lay hold of Christ, and thus, in Christ, of that righteousness which avails before God, for the sake of which this faith is imputed to us for righteousness. (Rom. 4, 5.)"

Therefore God's will, eternal purpose and counsel is summed up in the question: How can sinners be restored to grace, sonship and inheritance? The answer of the divine will is: "Solely for the sake of the merit of Christ, yet not in so far as it has been procured for all sinners, but only in so far it has been received and appropriated in faith. That God has another will, according to which particular sinners lying with all the others in a common perdition, are received, notwithstanding, into grace, sonship and the inheritance of eternal life, and given the righteousness of Christ, and simultaneously with it also sonship and inheritance by an immutable decree of salvation having no regard to faith,— of this the Confession knows absolutely nothing. Whenever the subject of the imputation and application of the righteousness, sonship and heirship which are in Jesus Christ is treated, faith is always the absolutely necessary link between the sinner and the merits of Christ which alone avail before God.

Note well how earnestly and diligently this is repeated in the article under consideration. We read: Concerning the righteousness of faith before God we unanimously believe, teach and confess, according to the comprehensive summary of our faith and confession above presented, viz. that a poor sinful man is justified before God, i. e. absolved and declared free and exempt from all his sins and from the sentence of well-deserved condemnation, and adopted into sonship and the inheritance of eternal life, without any merit or worthiness of his own, also without all

preceding, present or subsequent works, out of pure grace, alone because of the sole merit, complete obedience, bitter suffering, death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose obedience is reckoned to us for righteousness.

These treasures are offered us by the Holy Ghost in the promise of the Gospel; and faith alone is the only means whereby we lay hold upon, accept and apply and appropriate them to ourselves. This faith is a gift of God,* whereby we apprehend aright Jesus Christ our Redeemer in the Word of the Gospel, and trust in Him, that for the sake of His obedience alone out of grace, we have the forgiveness of sins, and before God the Father are regarded godly and righteous, and are eternally saved. (Phila. Ed., p. 571.)

Again: "Such righteousness (procured by Christ) is offered by the Holy Ghost through the Gospel and in the sacraments and is applied, appropriated and received through faith, whence (unde) believers have reconciliation with God, peace with God, forgiveness of sin, the grace of God, sonship and the heirship of eternal life." (M. p. 617; Phila. Ed., p. 572.)

Again: "Now everything that belongs to conversion" (for instance repentance) "belongs likewise to the article of justification, in which and to which only the following belong and are necessary: 1. The grace of God; 2. the merits of Christ; and 3. faith which receives this in the promise of the Gospel, whereby the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, whence we receive and have forgiveness of sin, reconciliation with God, grace, sonship and the heirship of eternal life." (M. 615; Phila. Ed., p. 572.)

Again: "Only the righteousness of the obedience, sufferings and death of Christ, which is imputed to faith, can stand before the tribunal of God, namely that alone for the sake of this

* If a misguided Missourian should say here: There we have it, 'faith is a gift of God,' therefore God has not first required faith before He ordained sinners to sonship and the inheritance — the following may serve as answer: Faith is always a gift of God in justification as well as in the eternal ordination to sonship and the inheritance, and in this eternal justification no more than in justification. But as it would be a most ridiculous and heretical conclusion to say that God can not require faith in justification because it is His gift, even so it would be a most ridiculous and heretical conclusion to say: Because in God's eternal election and ordination to sonship faith is a gift of God, therefore God can not ordain and elect certain sinners to sonship and the inheritance in view of faith. What blindness that would be!

obedience the person is pleasing and acceptable to God and is received into adoption and heirship of eternal life." (Haeres vitae aeternae scripta; M. p. 617; Phila. Ed. p. 579.)

Again: "We obtain salvation in the same way as righteousness, yea precisely by this means when we are justified, by faith, we receive adoption and heirship of eternal life and salvation." (M. p. 621; Phila. Ed., p. 579.)

The declaration already made in the Apology that the grace of God and the merits of Christ are so far from excluding faith as even to demand it, and are imputed alone to believers as such, is firmly and unambiguously corroborated in the Formula of Concord: "The Apology said: 'As often as mercy is spoken of, faith in the promise must be added and this faith makes the difference between those who are saved and those who are damned, between those who are worthy and those who are unworthy. For eternal life has been promised only to those who are reconciled with God in Christ. But faith reconciles and justifies us before God, whenever we apprehend the promise in faith.'" (M. p. 144; Phila. Ed., pp. 225 and 226.)

The Formula of Concord says: "The holy apostle Paul writes: 'Of grace,' 'without works,' 'not of works,' all these words taken together mean that we are justified and saved alone by faith in Christ. Eph. 2, 8; Rom. 1, 17; 3, 24; Gal. 3, 11; Heb. 1, 1. (M. p. 529; Phila. Ed., p. 502.)

"Therefore the expressions of St. Paul, that we are 'justified by faith' (Rom. 3, 28) or that 'faith is counted for righteousness' (Rom. 4, 5) or that 'by the righteousness of one justification by faith came upon all' (Rom. 5, 18) are regarded and received as equivalents." (M. p. 612; Phila. Ed., p. 572.)

"For faith makes righteous alone in that, as a means and instrument it lays hold of and accepts, in the promise of the Gospel, the grace of God and the merit of Christ." (M. p. 620; Phila. Ed., p. 518.)

But what has all that the Formula of Concord says of justification and the adoption into grace, sonship and the heirship of eternal life, to do with election? Simply this, it decides the main point of the controversy—namely the question, whether God has elected and ordained particular sinners to sonship and the heirship of eternal life, in preference to others according to a mere hidden pleasure (libitum or propositum arcanum)? Or whether, in this election and ordination of sinners to sonship and inherit-

ance, He has had regard to faith in Christ, receiving future believers as such into grace, sonship and the inheritance of eternal life?

For every sound biblical Christian the will of God in reference to sonship and the inheritance, as revealed in the execution of the plan of salvation and the Gospel, is a faithful reflection of the eternal counsel of God in relation to sonship and heirship. The will of God when making His decree in the eternal counsel, and His will in the execution of that decree surely must be one and the same in relation to one and the same thing. Otherwise the Gospel and the carrying out of the eternal purpose of God could not be the faithful and trustworthy revelation of His eternal will. This is the sense of the Formula of Concord when we are told emphatically and repeatedly that the true significance of predestination must be sought and learned in the revealed Gospel. What has been revealed in the Gospel as the true, only and immutable will of God in reference to sonship and the inheritance, that since God is truthful and His Word truth, must have been the true and immutable will of God from eternity and in the eternal counsel itself. His will is in time what it is, because God in eternity has so conceived and set it before Him. Only thus can the doctrine of justification maintain its central position as regards all evangelical doctrine and especially also the doctrine of election. as a part of the whole. We Lutherans do not consider the several articles of the Gospel as fragments, without connection and mutual affinity, which constitute the one faith once delivered to the saints merely because of their common revelation in the Bible. We believe, on the contrary, that the one faith delivered to the saints forms a harmonious whole, of which the constituent parts are so adjusted as to possess mutual agreement and inner cohesion. We, accordingly, do not see in the doctrine of justification an isolated doctrine, of which the contents, when considered by themselves, are entirely true, without, however, casting a clear and instructive light upon other scriptural doctrines and articles of faith. No, we make this doctrine the norm and centre of our doctrinal system, so that, like a sun, it throws light upon the whole Scripture and all articles of faith. The Holy Spirit Himself has placed this doctrine as a divinely ordained rule in the service of heremeneutics, when He says: "Let us prophecy according to the proportion of faith." (According to the analogy of faith; Rom. 12, 7)

It is true that the several articles of the Gospel doctrine are presented in scattered passages of Scripture as seats of doctrine (sedes doctrinae); but as Lutherans we protest against any attempt to interpret and understand these seats of doctrine in contradiction to the doctrine of justification, as it is clearly brought to our view. What is contained in the seats of the doctrine of election, in no wise contradicts the clearly revealed doctrine of justification. (Cf. Matt. 20 and 22; Rom. 8, 9 and 11; Eph. 1, 4 and 11, etc.) The subterfuge cannot be tolerated: Yes, that may be true of justification, but the doctrine of election is quite another article which cannot be rhymed with the doctrine of election. Any doctrine that cannot be "rhymed" with the doctrine of justification, bears on its face the brand of apostacy from the one revealed truth and stands disclosed as a false interpretation of Scripture. For this article of justification is "the chief topic of Christian doctrine, which, understood aright, illumines and magnifies the honor of Christ (which is of especial service for the clear, correct understanding of the entire Holy Scriptures, and alone shows the way to the unspeakable treasure and right knowledge of Christ and alone opens the door to the entire Bible." (Ap. Art. 4, Phila. Ed., p. 84.) "If this article is apprehended and kept with a sure and firm faith, the other articles will gradually follow. For in the same all articles of our faith are comprehended; if that is kept pure, the others are taken good care of." (Luther.) "This article is, as it were, the fortress and chief bulwark of the whole Christian doctrine and religion. If this article remains inviolate, the perversions of the other articles will cease of themselves." (Chemnitz.)

The doctrine of justification being followed, according to symbolical authority, as sun and guide, we are led to the one divine will respecting sonship and heirship which is this: In and with the merits of Christ, apprehended individually, all believers in the Son — all these and only these as such — shall become partakers of divine sonship and the inheritance of eternal life; not sinners without faith are appropriate subjects for adoption into grace and sonship on the part of God, but only believers in Christ, and they as such. This, then, is God's eternal, immutable will: "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (impossible to be received into grace and sonship and the inheritance of eternal life). In the execution in time, accordingly, actual faith must be the postulate of the actual reception into grace and son-

ship; in the eternal purpose future and foreseen faith must be the postulate of the particular decree by which, in the counsel concerning election, particular sinners, apart from others, on account of Christ, were foreordained to grace, sonship and the inheritance of eternal life. The decree, it is true, has been passed before time began, but the will of God is the same in the same relations, in this case the reception of sinners into grace, sonship, and the heirship of eternal life. Decree and execution are only different expressions or aspects of one and the same will of God: No man without faith can as such, merely for the sake of the merits of Christ, be received into sonship and the inheritance of eternal life, for "without faith it is impossible to please God," either in time or in eternity.

With this the Missourian and Calvinistic doctrine stand branded as a fearful perversion of the doctrine of election. It imputes a will to God, according to which particular sinners as such, without regard to faith, have been ordained to salvation, thus being received to grace, sonship and the inheritance of eternal life while sharing the common doom. This overturns the article of justification. For if it is taught that God has not had regard to faith when in the eternal counsel the question arose as to the justification of particular sinners and their adoption to grace, sonship and heirship, the doctrine will fall to the ground of itself that it is only believers in Christ as such who, according to the immutable will of God, shall, apart from others, be adopted into sonship and the heirship of eternal life. If it were true that God from eternity has elected for Himself particular sinners in preference to others as His dear children and heirs without having had regard to faith, it would be equally true that God recognizes now, in time, certain sinners as His children without having regard to faith. That these and not others are His children and heirs, faith has determined as little in justification as in election, if the contention of our opponents be correct. Not faith makes, in that case, the difference between those who are, in time, received into grace, sonship and heirship, and those who fail of such adoption, but this distinction has been made once for all in election, not indeed in view of faith, but merely according to a hidden purpose which is the differentiating cause for time as well as for eternity. Woe to Missouri that simple truths like these are blasphemed as rationalistic

deductions, and that Missouri, refusing to capitulate, takes its refuge in miserable subterfuges, because it feels its defeat and the pitiable weakness of its cause!

IV.

Let us now approach the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord with the question: "Has God made His eternal decree as to adoption into sonship and inheritance of eternal life with or without the consideration of foreseen faith? Has God in His counsel, when He decreed to restore certain sinners, in preference to others, unto grace, sonship and the heirship of eternal life, considered and required faith in His Son? Or has He considered nothing, not even the appropriated merits of Christ, but has He absolutely, from the common multitude preordained and predestinated this and that sinner to salvation including all the means and operations of grace necessary thereto, particularly repentance, faith, regeneration?

The position of the Lutheran Church is exceedingly clear since the time of the Formula of Concord. The eternal decree concerning the restoration unto divine sonship and the inheritance our Church has always numbered among those mysteries which have been, in a measure, clearly revealed. The question whether this decree has been passed upon believers or sinners, our Church has answered in the most lucid manner. With the greatest unanimity she laid down the proposition: "God has elected men to eternal life in view of faith," or: "God has elected those to eternal life, of whom He foresaw that they would believe in Christ." But the opposite doctrine that God has elected to eternal life, without regard to faith, those whom He pleased, our Church rejected as a fundamental Calvinistic falsehood and fought it as a "subversive error." Now comes Missouri after three hundred years and finds in this position of the Church a departure from Scripture and Symbol. The Scriptures as well as the Symbol are said to contain the doctrine (which our older Lutheran theologians unanimously rejected as Calvinistic heresy): God has elected certain sinners unto eternal salvation without previous consideration of faith, and by that at the same time also unto the call, unto conversion, sonship, perseverance, heirship, in short unto the whole way and unto all the means. For election, according to Missouri, is an insoluble collection of decrees passed upon certain sinners and extending from the call through all stages of the

order of salvation to final glory. Here everything is inseparably united. He who is embraced in the first of these decrees, is, of necessity and unfailingly, included also in the others. He who is elected unto the call is by that elected also unto perseverance. The whole collection of decrees is an inseparable whole, and as an inseparable unit postulates throughout the same things, viz. divine grace and redemption. Whatever belongs to this collection of decrees as a constituent part, can not belong to it as a postulate, for the same reason that the cause can not be the effect. Faith in Jesus is a particular part of this collection of decrees, therefore it can not be postulated in the decree of election as such. The Eternal Purpose narrows to election not when, according to the universal order of salvation, believers are reached, but in sinners who are in precisely the same relation to both Adam and Christ as all other sinners, being fallen sinners in Adam, redeemed sinners in Christ. And wherever election takes its start it completes itself according to its very nature. Where the first part is found, namely the call 'according to the purpose,' there the other elements, conversion, faith, perseverance, glory are the infallibly sure and certain consequence. From the time that election has touched its subject, it unfailingly prosecutes its operation up to its consummation. Also in the universal counsel of salvation the order of the constituent parts is the same, but the difference between the universal counsel of salvation and election consists in this, that the other parts must unfailingly follow whenever election makes a beginning (before the call); while the initial operations of the universal counsel of salvation may be experienced by many without its end being completely attained in each case. As far as the latter is concerned, it does not depend solely upon the conduct of God, but, in a certain sense, also upon the conduct of man. But election as an eternal decree of salvation, is simply an unconditional, arbitrary act of God toward certain men whose salvation has been decreed by God's free purpose and ordination without the least regard to their own conduct. Election as a special counsel of grace in this respect resembles redemption. Both have taken place without any regard to the future conduct of men. As God has redeemed all men without considering or inquiring about their conduct, even so He has ordained the elect to participation in all blessings and operations of grace without, in the least, inquiring as to their future conduct.

Accordingly the decree of adoption into sonship and heirship is a link in the chain of election, albeit the precedence of faith to adoption according to logical order is admitted. But because all the links of the chain are indissolubly connected and election as an inseparable unit sets in before the call and conversion, it is manifest that nothing on the side of man can be considered in the last part of the chain of election which was not considered in the first. When election sets in according to its first stage (the call according to the purpose) the whole chain of decrees must necessarily and unfailingly follow. As false as it would be to say: "The call of an elect person has taken place in view of his future faith, so false it would be to say: The adoption of an elect person has taken place in view of his future faith. For everything that has been decreed in regard to him has been decreed in view of the condition, in which election in its initial stage found him, i. e. when he was called. Whatever is found in him after that belongs to the chain of blessings of grace, which, by election, has linked itself to him, but the whole series of blessings has by a decree been assigned to him as one in the same state, in which the initial stage of election found him.

According to this evidently Calvinistic mode of reasoning the decree of adoption into sonship and heirship, and also the decree of justification and salvation can not be conceived in this way, that God made the apprehension of Jesus on the part of the sinner a requirement. For He had the elect before Him among the common multitude, when He determined their entire salvation by the immutable fiat of election including their glorification and everything that precedes. God has fixed and ordained the preceding stages only on account of the last, according to logical necessity. He has first elected unto salvation and secondly unto all the means necessary in decreeing the same. Missouri is perfectly consistent when the claim is set up that election, according to its doctrine, is quite a different thing from the universal counsel of salvation. While Calvinisits simply deny the universal counsel of salvation and know only of a decreeing counsel by which the salvation of the elect is determined, Missouri maintains the form of the universal counsel of salvation, but places by its side the counsel of predestination as quite a different thing. It puts between redemption and the call a twofold, divided counsel: 1) The universal counsel of salvation, which can be defeated in its operations by wilful resistance, and 2)

the particular counsel of election which has the certain salvation of only some particular persons for its object. This can not be defeated in its operations by wilful resistance, but it ordains immovably and unfailingly the final salvation of "particular persons." In the universal counsel of salvation, Missouri thinks, God desires the salvation of all men, but does not intend to ordain it without first considering their conduct toward His call of grace. But in the counsel of election He ordains in behalf of particular persons among the common multitude their complete and unfailing salvation, and everything that belongs to it; and this act of election is the comprehensive and unfailing decree of salvation covering certain sinners, without any consideration of their future faith.

Such a counsel of election is manifestly not the universal counsel of salvation, nor can such an elective decree be harmonized with the universal benevolence of God. The universal and the particular counsel are diametrically opposed to each other. They are not only two different kinds of counsel, but logically contradict one another in their relation to the elect. The elect, according to Missouri, are both under the universal counsel of salvation and under the particular counsel of election. When considering them as standing under the one, God is said to will their adoption into sonship and heirship not without the previous consideration of future faith, just as He does not decree the adoption of the other sinners, because He looked for faith in them without finding it. According to the universal counsel of grace, there is, accordingly, no difference between the elect and the reprobate. He ordains neither the one nor the other without previous consideration as to the necessary qualification, yea, He determines the exclusion of both from the decree conferring sonship and heritage, unless He finds in them faith in Jesus. Now comes that "thing which is quite different", the counsel of election, which "hovers only over certain persons", and notwithstanding the universal counsel of salvation, it determines, in their behalf, the exact opposite. It determines, without previous consideration of faith, that these "certain persons", considered merely as redeemed sinners, shall be received into grace, sonship and heirship. In the same relation in which the universal gracious will of God pronounced over them a categorical "no", the particular elective will pronounces an equally categorical "yes". In so far as the elect stand, as foreseen non-believers, under the universal counsel of grace, the decision of the will of God

in regard to them is: No; considered as non-believers, I can and will ordain your adoption into sonship and heirship no more than that of the others. But in as far as they are considered as standing under the particular decree of election, although in the same condition as in the former relation, the decision of the will of God is exactly the opposite: Yes, without previous consideration of your future faith, your adoption into sonship and heirship shall be decided as immovably and eternally certain. If Missouri would merely teach a twofold counsel and will of salvation, according as the elect or non-elect are treated of, it would at least be free from the opprobrium of imputing a contradictory will to God. If, now, we have, according to the pattern of the Formula of Concord,* the right, to reject a doctrine among other reasons for this also, that it imputes to God contradictory wills, the doctrine of Missouri, can surely not escape this judgment. Missouri, in a measure admits this, inasmuch as it speaks of its counsel of election as "quite another thing," which really can not be rhymed with the universal counsel of grace. The Scriptures are said to establish something concerning election which we know to be untrue according to the universal gracious will of God. Already with this monstrous principle in itself Missouri departs from the Symbol. The Symbol establishes the principle that no contradictory will should be imputed to God. Missouri does this notwithstanding by letting the will of God be now "yes", now "no", regarding persons in precisely the same relations, according as He answers either according to His universal gracious will or according to His decreeing will the question: "Shall these particular persons be received into grace, sonship and the inheritance of eternal life?" Missouri, beyond a doubt, imputes, in respect to the elect, a twofold and contradictory will to God. The elective will of God is not only entirely different from the universal gracious will of God, according to Missouri, but it practically neutralizes and abolishes the same, as far as the elect are concerned. Where the one says "no ', the other says just as positively "yes".

The Formula of Concord has not dreamed of laying the decree of adoption into sonship and heirship down as embracing

* "Hoc esset contradictorias voluntates Deo affingere"; that is, in such a way that God, who is eternal truth, would be taught to be contrary to Himself. (Phila. ed. p. 655; § 34.) And this the symbol says on the very subject of election and the universal counsel of salvation in point of the call.

merely "certain persons", without regard to their future faith. It has not dreamed of fixing, in this respect, a bridgeless chasm or insurmountable wall of separation, or even of representing the will of God as in logical contradiction with itself. For the question: To what persons does the decree of adoption into sonship and heirship apply? has, according to our Symbol, one and the same answer, in harmony with the Word of God, whether we speak of election or of the universal will of God. God's will, in this matter, is clearly revealed, says the Formula of Concord; but not as a double one in contradiction with itself, according as the sedes doctrinae of election or those of the universal gracious will of God are consulted, but the answer is always the same. On the other hand, if the scriptural passages that treat of election are consulted in the sense of Missouri and afterward those that treat of the universal gracious will of God, a twofold answer is received. The scriptural passages which treat of election are to be understood as saying: "Yes, without consideration of faith"; but the passages that treat of the universal gracious will of God, are to be understood as saying: "No, not without consideration of future faith." And now, says Missouri, we are to believe both. That means concerning the same thing or question in the same relation the Christian is to believe two different things, according as he considers the one or the other class of scriptural passages. When he reads or considers the sedes of doctrinae of election, he is required to believe that they contain as revealed truth that the decree of adoption into sonship and heirship embraces only certain sinners without consideration of faith. But when he considers the sedes doctrinae of the universal gracious will, he is required to believe the contrary, that the decree of adoption into sonship and inheritance embraces the same persons, but as believers in Jesus, i. e. not without consideration of faith. Whoever does not consider this with Missouri as the highest rung on the ladder of Christian faith, has long since been anathemized by Missouri as a "blasphemous rationalist" and as one who denies the Christian principle of faith.

The eleventh article of the Formula of Concord treats in detail of election. An essential part of this election, whether we extend the conception or narrow it, is the eternal decree of adoption into sonship and heirship. This decree is the essential kernel of "election." Concerning what persons has God ordained that they should be restored to grace, sonship and the heirship

of eternal life? The Formula of Concord does not beg this question. Yet the answer is not worded ambiguously like this: "This is a mystery; this has not been revealed." Nor do we receive the answer: "Concerning this matter nothing has been revealed but that the elect are the persons who are finally saved." Still less does it answer that God has told us in reference to this matter something quite different in the passages that speak of election, from what we learn in the passages that treat of the universal gracious will. But the answer comes clear and unequivocal: "God has given us a lucid and plain revelation respecting this matter, and secondly, the sedes doctrinae of election reveal the same thing as the scriptural passages treating of the universal gracious will. This, according to the Formula of Concord, is the substance of both classes of sedes doctrinae that God has ordained from eternity in His counsel and purpose: "that He will justify and receive into sonship and the heirship of eternal life all those who, in true repentance and right faith apprehend Jesus Christ."*

This, the Formula of Concord says, belongs to the right definition of election. This belongs to the "right meaning" of election, in contradistinction to that false opinion which is to be rejected that election is a sort of military drafting. The same

* Thus wrote Luther in his comments on Is. 42, 1 (Behold, my servant, whom I uphold, mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth): "Therefore all men should hear and believe this servant. This servant alone who has such weighty testimonies, can make us certain of the gracious and good will of the Father. When we believe Him, also we shall be made servants and elect ones of God." "Now our whole destiny, either salvation or damnation depends upon this, whether we believe or not, and the judgment has been pronounced already which closes and denies heaven to those who reject this faith, nor desire to receive it." (Erl. 50, 58). In so far, therefore, as election is the real elective decree of salvation embracing some particular persons, and makes a difference among sinners as those who are to be saved according to God's eternal counsel and purpose, and those who shall not be saved, it applies not to sinners without faith, but to sinners whose faith has been foreseen. Not sinners as such, not redeemed men as such, not sinners who are merely called, but believers as such, i. e. persons who know Christ, receive Him in true faith and by virtue of His apprehended merit have been justified and reconciled with God, are, according to His gracious pleasure, received into grace out of His pleasure in Jesus Christ, in such a way, that He has given them in preference to others sonship, the heirship of eternal life and heaven and the promise of eternal blessedness. That is the doctrine of our Confession.

truth, it must not be overlooked, belongs to the universal gracious will, for God desires to receive all men into sonship and heritage in precisely the same manner. But when we speak of the final "election or ordination to salvation," it belongs by a necessity equally absolute, to "a correct, healthy opinion of the matter, that the decree of adoption into sonship and heritage was formed in exact harmony with the universal gracious will of God, embracing, consequently not sinners as such or persons merely redeemed as such, or least of all "certain persons," or "a few," or "some men," but exclusively and definitely "all those who in true repentance and right faith apprehend Jesus Christ." These and no others! And—so dreams Missouri—God has not at all looked or seen who these people would be? He has, without any consideration of future faith, resolved to restore to grace, to elect as His dear child and heir "this or that particular person"? Shame, in time and in eternity upon a presumption which imputes to our dear Formula of Concord such an execrable idea, in spite of its explicit testimony, where it furnishes "ex professo" a definition or declaration of the logical essence of election.

How can you, who are mere tyros in the role of performers, treat the Confession in such a way and foist upon it the exact opposite of its own explicit explanation? Is it any wonder that you carry your dreams even into the Scriptures and dream of the eternal decree concerning sonship and heirship as two contradictory doctrines and beliefs; the one determined by the universal gracious will, the other by the particular elective will; the one that God has willed to ordain not a single sinner to sonship and heritage without previous consideration of the merits of Christ apprehended in faith,—the other that He has done this, notwithstanding, by ordaining the adoption of certain sinners as His dear children and heirs of heaven without previous regard to future faith.*

* "You blind rationalist," — Missouri will say here — "this is the great mystery that the two doctrines of the universal gracious will of God and of election can not be harmonized. This we have affirmed a hundred times. For that God would not ordain any sinner to sonship and heirship without having regard to the apprehended merits of Christ, we are taught by the clear passages which treat of the universal benevolence of God. But that God has really ordained certain persons to eternal life without previous consideration of their future faith, we are taught in the passages treating of election." This, then, is the great Missourian mystery that the Scriptures give in regard to the same matter in the same

According to the Formula of Concord the revealed universal will of God is also a part of the doctrine of "election," for it is expressly stated in the eighty-third paragraph that it is God's revealed will to receive into grace all those who repent and believe in Christ. This truth is, as it were, the guiding motive and principle of this separative election unto sonship and inheritance. Here a separation takes place between those who are elected unto sonship and inheritance and those who are not. Faith makes the difference here between the worthy and the unworthy. Only those of whom God foresees and foreknows that "in true repentance they receive Jesus Christ as their Savior", come under the elective decree that confers sonship and inheritance. All others — all those whom God does not foresee as future believers in the Son — are on this account and for this reason excluded from election, because this act of God is controlled by the revealed principle or purpose: "That all who believe in Him should not perish but have everlasting life."

On this account the Epitome says so firmly and emphatically that we should seek in Christ the eternal election of the Father; "for the Father has ordained in His eternal counsel to save no one except those who acknowledge and believe in His Son, Jesus Christ."* Such was the will of God in the act of ordination and election respecting sonship and salvation. To be sure, it is a thankless task to conduct a controversy with people who strike

---

relation one answer in one series of passages and another answer in another series of passages, saying at one time "yes" and another time "no." This means to make God, who is the truth Himself, a liar. He will guard His honor!

* Query: "What is the eternal election of the Father which we are to seek in Christ?" Answer: "That the Father has ordained in His eternal, divine counsel that He would save no one except those who acknowledge and truly believe in His Son Jesus Christ." Second question: "Does this election exclude certain sinners from salvation?" Answer: "It is the purpose of the Father to save no one except those who believe in Jesus Christ and therefore it excludes all sinners without faith." Third question: "To what did the Father look, when He elected to salvation in Jesus Christ?" Answer: "He has considered, whether sinners acknowledge His Son Jesus Christ and truly believe in Him or not; the former as believers He has elected in Jesus Christ, that they should be saved through Him, the latter as unbelievers He did not elect." Faith makes the difference between the unworthy and the worthy, for thus it has been ordained of God, not to save any one except he believes in Christ."

the clear, explicit text of the Confession in the face, refusing to submit to its statements as they lie plainly before us, as they have been unanimously understood by the Church of the time, and defended and quoted against Calvinists and Huberians; thus forcing upon the Confession the exact opposite of what it declares in so many words "as the true and correct definition of our Church." Only when a person purposely closes his eyes, or with his eyes open refuses to see, will he fail to perceive that when the Formula of Concord speaks of the decree conferring sonship and heirship, it unites this "expressis verbis" to faith and repentance. In this way it presents election as having taken place "in Christ", yet not in Christ still unapprehended, but in Christ as apprehended by faith.

But does this agree with the trend of the eleventh article and with its general import? Or are the passages quoted by us and resembling each other, mere fragments torn from the context — requiring study indeed, and apparently closely akin to the Intuitu fidei theory, but receiving quite a new light when considered in connection with the article as a whole?

The trend of this article is evidently against the Calvinistic conception of election. The fact, that the doctrine of the universal gracious will of God concerning redemption, the call of grace, and the evangelical promises, is repeatedly accorded such prominence, and woven and welded into the orthodox presentation of the doctrine of election, bears witness to the correctness of this view. The Formula of Concord does not tear apart the universal counsel of grace and the particular counsel of election as two different things separated from each other as wildly as heaven and earth; nor does it present these two counsels as presenting a mysterious and insoluble contradiction. The very opposite is true, the Formula presents both as being most intimately connected with each other. Again and again it discloses the universality of the foundation of human salvation, as the basis for the correct conception of election, according to the Scriptures, and according to the analogy of faith. The gross particularism and absolutism of the Calvinistic doctrine of election is especially and most thoroughly refuted. This is clear from the words of the eleventh article: "This eternal election or appointment of God to eternal life is also not to be considered merely in God's secret, inscrutable counsel in such a manner as though it comprises in itself nothing further, or nothing more belonged thereto, and

nothing more were considered therein, than that God foresaw how many would be saved, and who and how many would be damned, or that He only held a review, and would say thus: "This one shall be saved, that one shall be damned; this one shall remain steadfast in the faith to the end, that one shall not remain steadfast" (Phila. ed. p. 651). "This false delusion and dangerous thoughts" (§ 12), from which nothing can flow but despondency and despair (§ 10) is to be thoroughly destroyed, but over against it the "right meaning and sound sense, the 'vera and sana sententia' is to be explained from the foundation of the Scriptures (juxta praescriptum et analogiam verbi dei (§§ 2 and 12.) For the doctrine of election, according to the Formula of Concord, does not constitute an isolated and solitary fragment which, as a mere particle of revealed truth, stands in no relation to the remainder of revealed truth; on the contrary, the doctrine of election according to our Confession, is decidely in keeping with the whole analogy of faith, and especially with the fundamental article of the justification and salvation of the sinner by faith alone. The Formula of Concord, therefore, is very careful to turn away from human thoughts, which presumptuously busy themselves about this fathomless abyss, and, following their own prompting, go off in all kinds of speculations, surmises and conclusions; it fixes its gaze steadfastly upon the Word, and nothing but the Word. "This predestination", says our Confession, (Epitome XI, 5) "is not to be investigated in the secret counsel of God, but to be sought in the Word of God, where it is also revealed." Neither should we investigate the secret, concealed abyss of divine predestination, but should give heed to the revealed will of God. For He "Hath made known to us the mystery of His will", and made it manifest through Christ that it might be preached. Eph. 1, 9 sqq.; 2 Tim. 1, 9 sqq. (Decl. XI, 26.)

By this the Formula of Concord does not deny that much in this "mystery", when taken as a whole, is reserved and hidden. This is true of the counsel formed in eternity and of its execution in time both as to general scope and numerous separate features. It mentions quite a number of such reserved features and unanswered questions, and fixes the necessary limits of legitimate inquiry. (Decl. XI, 54-62.) However, it is a matter of the greatest importance and the most far-reaching effect that the Confession places the centre of gravity, as "revealed in the Word

and to be sought therein", not in the unrevealed part of the mystery but, carefully and purposely in the part which has been revealed, and admonishes us to determine the "right meaning" and the right use of this doctrine from the revelations of the Word.

The Epitome as well as the Declaratio commend most assiduously a careful distinction between the revealed and the hidden part of the mystery of predestination, and prohibits a mingling of the one with the other by enveloping that which has been revealed in mysterious darkness, or by treating that which has not been revealed as an object of faith or of speculation. This distinction between the revealed and the unrevealed part of the mystery of election, and the corresponding treatment of the doctrine, is the true key to the proper understanding of the eleventh article. The Lutheran Church has well understood the true tendency of the eleventh article, which is apparent from the later elaboration of the doctrine of election. The shape given this doctrine by the Church is determined by the part known and revealed, thus giving a well merited rebuff to Calvinistic dabbling in mysteries so destructive of the revealed foundation of salvation. And when Missouri now tries, by the use of Calvinistic arguments, to demonstrate away the part of the doctrine on which revelation has shed a bright light, and emphasizes once more the unrevealed "mystery" of election as the very essence of our faith in regard to election, it merely furnishes evidence of a decided departure from the historical interpretation of the eleventh article, yea of being diametrically opposed to the very article every part of which it professes to subscribe word for word. The Formula of Concord flees, as far as the correct conception and use of this article is concerned, again and again from the mysterious side into the clearly revealed fundamental doctrines of the Word, finding these a safe bulwark against all pernicious thought (pravae, sinistrae opiniones) and blasphemous dreams. Missouri, on the other hand, views with proud Calvinistic contempt the illumined part which has been revealed in the Gospel, and flees from all the revealed points of the doctrine into the impenetrable mystery that "hovers over certain persons." In this dark, mysterious abyss of the "mystery" the Missourian doctrine of election lives and thrives as its very life element. Whatever the passages that treat particularly of election contain, Missouri takes to the border of that abyss and lets us gaze into the darkness of the mystery that hovers

over certain persons! Even the clearest passages, for instance those that refer to the decree conferring sonship and heirship upon foreseen believers as such, Missouri likes to envelop in a nebulous mysterious darkness; yea, even denies them with Calvin, in order to save the "mystery hovering over certain persons." The Formula of Concord sees in the revealed will of God, "that all those who by a true faith apprehend Jesus Christ" shall be saved, an essential part of the revealed doctrine of election and ordination to eternal life. This revealed will of God is considered by the Formula as a bright beam of light cast by the Gospel upon the mystery of election. Missouri, however, thinks that this view divests the doctrine of election of its mystery, solves the same, and makes it plausible to reason. It, therefore, accepts "election unto sonship" as synonymous with "election unto faith" and then amalgamates the two as a mystery "hovering over certain persons." Yes, Missouri finds its definition of election purporting to be drawn from sedes doctrinae, in that part of the mystery of election which it has pleased God not to reveal; and this it does in clear contradiction to the Confession. "One is hardened, blinded, given over to a reprobate mind, while another who is, indeed, in the same guilt, is converted"; such unexplained features Missouri looks upon as pivotal to the whole doctrine of election. In them Missouri finds its "election without regard to anything", election "according to sovereign right", election as "a mystery hovering over certain persons", most clearly enunciated, and by such processes it has formulated a definition of election ("this one shall be saved, this one shall be rejected"), which resembles the drafting of soldiers for military service as one egg resembles another.

The Formula of Concord would also have us understand, in what sense the doctrine of election has been revealed in the Word and is to be sought there; not, however, as though certain passages could be found which, in contradiction to others, speak of a mysterious ordination unto sonship and heirship, in which no regard is had of faith. On the contrary, the doctrine of election, as taught in the Formula of Concord, has been revealed "in the Gospel" in so far as it holds out Jesus as the Savior of all men and calls them to repentance and faith. The Epitome, therefore, declares: "But the Word of God leads us to Christ who is the Book of Life, in whom all are written and elected that are to be saved, as it is written (Eph. 1, 4): 'He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world.'"

"Thus Christ calls to Himself all sinners and promises them rest, and He is anxious that all men should come to Him and permit Him to help them. To them He offers Himself in His Word, and wishes them to hear it, and not to stop their ears and despise the Word."

"He promises besides the power and efficiency of the Holy Ghost, and divine assistance for perseverance and eternal salvation (that we may remain steadfast in the faith and attain eternal salvation)."

"Therefore we should judge concerning this our election to eternal life neither from reason nor from the law of God, which would lead either into a dissipated, dissolute, epicurean life, or into despair and would excite in the hearts of men pernicious thoughts (and such thoughts can not effectually be guarded against as long as they follow their own reason), so that they think to themselves: 'If God has elected me to salvation, I can not be condemned, although I do whatever I will'. And again: 'If I am not elected to eternal life, it matters not what good I do; for my efforts are nevertheless all in vain.'"

"But the true judgment concerning predestination must be learned alone from the Gospel concerning Christ, in which it is clearly testified that God has 'concluded them all under unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all', and 'that He is not willing that any should perish, but that all come to repentance.'" (§§ 6-9; Phila. ed. pp. 525 and 526.)

Accordingly, "election has been revealed in the Gospel", but not only in some few passages that speak exclusively of the elect; nor has it been revealed merely for the sake of these elect, as though this mystery did not concern the others, but quite in general, in as far as the general Gospel for poor sinners is the authentic revelation of the will of God unto all men and for all men. The Gospel, as it is preached to all men without distinction, is at the same time the revelation of election, for it clearly teaches that God desires to show His grace to all men, to adopt them all unto sonship and heirship, to ordain them all in Christ unto salvation. It presents Jesus as the book of life, leads them to salvation, and offers it to them (i. e. election and ordination unto the same) on account of Christ, "as He has promised this gracious election not with mere words, but has also certified it with an oath, and sealed it with the holy sacraments, which we can call to mind in our most severe temptations, and from them

comfort ourselves, and thereby quench the fiery darts of the devil." (Ep. XI, 13: Phila. ed., p. 527.) This, it is true, takes place only within the prescribed order of repentance and faith, which appertains to all men in general, so that God, as far as He is concerned, earnestly invites all men without distinction to repentance and faith. If all would come, all would also have been elected and ordained in Christ to eternal life. It all depends on this and according to it the decision is rendered; because the Father has decided in His purpose, in His eternal counsel thus and not otherwise, that all those who in true faith apprehend Jesus Christ, shall be received, ordained and elected unto grace, the adoption, and inheritance of eternal life. How many, and who they will be, God knows with exactness and certainty, for He saw it before the time of the world. (Decl. XI, 54. Phila. ed., p. 659.)

The believers that God foresaw are they who are written in Christ, the book of life, and elected to eternal salvation. But as Christ, the Gospel, the call, and the order of repentance and faith, are open to all sinners without distinction, thus also the possibility of election, since the latter links itself by means of God's foreknowledge to repentance and faith now in time. The eternal decree of election does not embrace merely "certain persons", but those who are called, who apprehend Jesus and have been foreseen as such. In short, election is not absolute, as though it had taken place without previous consideration of repentance and faith in Jesus Christ; on the contrary, election is relative, being determined by the foreknowledge of God of the persons who shall believe.

It attains its end by virtue of the divine foreknowledge within the established order of repentance and faith, which is available for all, and could have embraced all men just as well, if they only, in pursuance of the call of grace, had permitted themselves to be led to repentance and faith.*

* The Formula of Concord does not, like Missouri, place the consummation of the elective decree between Christ and the order of repentance and faith, as though merely certain persons, for the sake of the merits of Christ (unapprehended) were ordained to repentance and faith. But the Confession brings the consummation of the elective decree within the order of repentance and faith, and at the same time presents it as having taken place in Christ. Yea, it understands the "in Christ" as: in the Savior, who objectively is the Savior of all men, but subjectively only of believers, since it is impossible to please God without faith. As a mere book of life even Christ benefits no man. The very wording of the

This conception of election, viewing it as a part of the universal order of repentance and faith, and as open to all men through the call of grace extended to all, is set forth more clearly still in the Declaratio. There we read: "Therefore this eternal election of God is to be considered in Christ, and not beyond and without Christ. For 'in Christ' testifies the apostle Paul, 'He hath chosen us before the foundation of the world; as it is written: He hath made us acceptable in the Beloved.' But this election is revealed from heaven through the preached Word when the Father says (Matt. 17, 5): 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him.' And Christ says (Matt. 11, 28): 'Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, I will give you rest.' And concerning the Holy Ghost Christ says (John 16, 14): 'He shall glorify me, for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.' Therefore the entire Holy Trinity, Father, Son and

---

Confession shows in many places that it conceives of election unto sonship and heirship as the execution of the provisions contained in the foundation of the order of salvation, following the rule established for all men without distinction: Whosoever apprehends Jesus in true faith shall be received into grace, sonship and heirship, and besides these no one else. If many shall do this, many shall be elected; if all shall do this, all shall be elected; but because only a few do it, therefore, and for no other reason, only a few are elected. The signers of the Formula of Concord have testified in the clearest possible manner that this is the true Lutheran doctrine in contradistinction to that of the Calvinists; and Missouri must wilfully kick against the pricks, if it desires to demonstrate its "mystery hovering over certain persons" into the Formula of Concord. As far as men are concerned it may go on kicking much as it pleases, but it will be compelled to cease before the judgment seat of God. Hear what the Wittenberg fathers of the Formula of Concord of 1596 have to say: "When we speak of eternal predestination and election, we say that God has ordained not certain persons, but all who believe in Christ and persevere in faith to the end, so that, if more would believe in Christ, God would not have passed them by in His ordination of sinners to eternal life, but would have included them as well as the rest; and if others fall from grace, we say that they have never been numbered with the Christians on account of their falling away which God foresaw from all eternity, but not on account of a mere ordination." (Page 132) "A great difference between our true doctrine and the crror of the Calvinists will be found also when the number of the elect is taken into consideration. For the Calvinists say that He has elected certain persons, because the pleasure of His will embraced these in preference to others, without considering faith, and that the number of these elect is so definite and unchangeable that it can not be increased or diminished. These views we reject according to the Word of God." (Page 176).

Holy Ghost, direct all men to Christ, as to the Book of Life, in which they should seek the eternal election of the Father. For it has been decided by the Father from eternity that whom He would save He would save through Christ. (John 14, 6): 'No man cometh to the Father but by me.' And again (John 10, 9): 'I am the door; by me, if any man shall enter in, he shall be saved.'" (Note well that the Formula of Concord states in so many words, that in the call from heaven: "My Son ye shall hear", election from heaven is revealed. When, furthermore, the Formula of Concord says that all men are directed by the Holy Trinity to Christ as the book of life, Missouri wants us to understand that all men are to find in Christ merely "a mystery hovering over a few" without regard to repentance and faith. This mystery is said not only to have been promised to us in the Gospel, but also confirmed with an oath (Ez. 33), and sealed by the Holy Sacraments! — Are those "certain persons, over whom hovers this mystery of election, elected in Christ irrespective of the observance of the order of repentance and faith? This is what Missouri teaches, but not the Formula of Concord; for that Symbol explains the rationale of election as we see anon: "But Christ as the only-begotten Son of God who is in the bosom of the Father, has published to us the will of the Father, and thus also our eternal election to eternal life, viz. when He says (Mark 1, 15): 'Repent ye and believe the Gospel; the kingdom of God is at hand.' He also says (John 6, 40): 'This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life.' And again: 'God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.'. This proclamation the Father wishes that all men should hear, and that they should come to Christ." (§§ 65-86. Phila. ed., pp. 660 and 661.)

What definition do our eyes behold in utterances like these? Is election here taken as an absolute mystery, which as an ordination unto salvation hovers merely "over certain persons"? Is it not rather an election strictly determined by the revealed will of the Father: "Whoever repents and believes shall be saved (i. e. is elected)?" Is it not clearly an election which has taken place, not without, but with explicit regard to faith?

A person would indeed be stricken with blindness, or his desire to pervert must have become a mania, if he would understand the Formula of Concord to mean: Men are not to seek

their own election in Christ, which is a possibility held out to every one, by heeding the call of grace, repenting of their sins and believing in Christ; but all men should seek their election, which as an absolute mystery hovers only over certain persons, in Christ by learning the truth of Him, that God according to His elective will, has determined to ordain only a few unto salvation and unto all the means necessary to the attainment thereof, but that the elect now in time are unfailingly called to repentance and endowed with it (without regard to their own conduct). Manifestly the Confession intends to say the reverse, namely that, according to the gracious will of the Father, repentance and faith are open to all men as the way unto Christ, and therewith also the way unto election in Christ, who is the true way of life. To all men the way is open to become participants in the election of God, for the way to faith in Christ is open to them, and that is the way that leads to Christ as the book of life, so that all men ought to be and could be elected in Christ, just as they all could be saved in Christ, if they believed. For as salvation is offered to them in Christ, thus also election or ordination to the same is offered, likewise, as a possibility which all can attain in Christ by hearing the Word and coming to Jesus, through the new powers bestowed by the Word, and permitting Him to help them.

"Therefore no one who would be saved, should trouble or harass himself with thoughts concerning the secret counsel of God, as to whether he also is elected and ordained to eternal life, for with these miserable Satan is accustomed to attack and annoy godly hearts. But they should hear Christ (and in Him look upon the book of life in which is written the eternal election);* who testifies to all men without distinction that it is God's will that all men who labor and are heavy laden with sin should come to Him in order that He may give them rest and save them (Matt. 2, 28; Decl. XI, § 70. Phila. ed., p. 661.) But if God wills that all men should come to Christ and be saved, it surely must have been His will to elect them all in Christ unto salvation, provided they would believe. The actual "election", therefore, has taken place with strict regard to faith in Christ. All who shall believe,

* Ut in eo aeternam patris praedestinationem investigent et cognoscant. All, men, accordingly, are to seek their election in Christ and in the Gospel, meaning that they are to trace it, as it were, to investigate, to decipher and by accurate search to recognize and explore it, as the Latin terms indicate.

whether they be all men, or many, or only a few, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, these or those — all believers in Christ shall have part in the election in Christ. All non-believers, however, shall be excluded. For on one hand God has ordained in His counsel to restore all those who in true repentance and faith apprehend Jesus, unto grace, sonship and heirship and to elect them thereto. On the other hand He has ordained in His counsel also, to save no one except those who believe in His Son Jesus Christ. Hence where He did not foresee faith, He did not choose to elect; where He was to elect, He wanted to foresee faith. For it was as true then as it is to-day: "Without faith it is impossible to please God" and to be restored unto grace, sonship and heirship, or to be ordained thereto.

Although the Formula of Concord does not say in so many words that election as an ordination of certain persons unto sonship, heirship and salvation has taken place in strict harmony with the universal revealed order of salvation, which directs all men to Christ as their Savior, calls all men to repentance and invites them to faith, promises to all men all grace necessary for salvation and offers it to them, it is patent that this is the sense of the Formula of Concord. Therefore it points so often to the revelation of election in the Gospel, links the same in the most intimate manner with the revealed will of God in reference to the salvation of all men through Christ and faith in Him, and emphasizes repeatedly that all men should seek, seek, seek, the election in Christ in the Gospel, in the revealed will of the Father, in the universal call to repentance and faith, in the universal promises of grace, in the oath of God (Ez. 33, 11), in the sacraments, in short in the universal order of salvation, as it is intended for all, and as all can and should be saved through it. But will all men be able to find it there? To be sure, if election is "a thing quite different" from the universal order of salvation, they would seek in vain, nor would they find a syllable of an election as pertaining to themselves. Missouri's election can not be traced in the universal order of salvation from beginning to end; it corresponds with this order at no point; nowhere does it form a piece, or a link, or a part of the counsel of salvation. It lies completely outside of the universal counsel of salvation and rests upon quite another, a particular, elective will as its foundation. God's gracious will is not for all men, to firmly ordain them without regard to their personal conduct, unto a whole series of operations and blessings

of grace, and to comprehend the whole sum of such blessings of grace in one positive, absolute, irrevocable decree. If God would have had such a gracious will toward all men, if it had pleased Him to place for all alike, without consideration of their personal conduct, the comprehensive decree of election unto all necessary operations and blessings of grace, immediately after their redemption and before the call of grace, undoubtedly all men would have been elected and all men would be saved. But God has in His universal order of salvation only one decree of election, which is ordinate and conditional. It is this: "If", he says to all men, "if you permit yourselves to be converted, if you apprehend Jesus in faith, if you persevere in faith, in short, if you conform to the universal order of salvation, you may and shall be elected and ordained unto salvation." This is the rule of election in the universal counsel of salvation, and to this universal, conditional, deferential rule of election the Formula of Concord wishes to refer all men (also the lect), so that in this they may recognize and seek election as it has really taken place.

Here lies the fundamental difference between Missouri and the Formula of Concord. Missouri rejects the election, which has been clearly revealed in the Gospel, in Christ, in the order of salvation according to the universal rule: Repent and believe in Christ, and you shall, without fail, be elected and ordained to salvation. That, Missouri contends, would be the genuine "intuitu fidei", whereby the "mystery" is made plausible to reason. It prefers to establish a definition of election which is a thing quite different from the universal counsel of salvation, for it is utterly impossible to find the former in the latter, it is even diametrically opposed to the latter and subversive of the rule of election revealed in the latter. The rule of election is, according to the Formula of Concord, the will of the Father clearly revealed in the Gospel: All those who believe in Christ, shall be restored to grace, sonship, and inheritance of eternal life. That is the "right judgment", and the right understanding of revealed election which all men can seek and find in the Gospel, in Christ, in the order of salvation, for their own salvation. Missouri, on the other hand, spurns, reviles, rejects this revealed rule of election, which gives to all men the necessary information concerning the mystery of election, saying that this has not been the principle or purpose of election, but that God has absolutely elected and ordained certain

men, without the previous consideration of their relation to Christ, unto the entire series of the blessings and operations of grace.

It is important to add that the Formula of Concord presents the doctrines of election and justification as confirmatory and explanatory of each other. It says (Decl. XI, 43): "It establishes very effectually the article that we are justified and saved without our works and merits of ours, purely out of grace alone, for Christ's sake. For before the ages of the world, before we were born, even before the foundation of the world was laid, when we indeed could do nothing good, we were, according to God's purpose, chosen, out of grace, in Christ unto salvation. Rom. 9, 11; 2 Tim. 1, 9."

The election of grace is not an election on account of works or of merits, but an "election of grace", purely out of grace, for the sake of Christ. Our own works and merits are entirely excluded. Solely the merits and work of Christ determine the election of grace; they alone determine who shall and who shall not be ordained unto salvation. The Formula of Concord, therefore, points to the saying of Paul: "For the children being not yet born, neither having done good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth; it was said of her, the older shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Good works can accomplish nothing in an election of grace; for, if it be of grace, it cannot be of the merit of works, otherwise it were not grace. Evil works (sin, transgressions of the law) cannot abolish the election of grace, for otherwise they could not all be sinners and transgressors of the law whom God has elected in Christ before the foundation of the world was laid. If God had chosen to include some men in consideration of their good works, and to exclude others in consideration of evil works, He could not have included any one, but would have been compelled to exclude them all, for they are all sinners and have come short of the glory of God. The same thing is true of justifiction, in which God out of pure grace, only for the sake of Jesus Christ, according to the purpose of His grace, considers us believers as just and receives us into grace. Neither election nor justification can be earned by good works, but both are communicated to sinners, according to the purpose of the Father's grace in Jesus Christ, His Son.

Then also faith, Missouri will now clamor, and man's atti-

tude toward the order of salvation, must be strictly excluded as a condition or postulate from election, for God has looked to nothing, absolutely nothing, nor has He required anything, when He unfailingly elected and ordained certain persons unto salvation and unto everything necessary for attaining it, viz. unto all the operations and blessings of grace. If God had chosen to see first of all who among the called would yield to the divine grace and apprehend Jesus in faith, and who would not, making it a principle or rule of election to elect only believers unto sonship and heirship, and to exclude non-believers, He would have sought a "something in us", a deed, a performance, a work, a merit, a worthiness in us, and determined His election accordingly. Here, therefore, any regard to faith and all conduct toward the order of salvation must remain excluded.

O blind Missourian, how has the devil in his most seductive mask of light, deceived you, so that you cannot see the woods on account of the trees! Election and justification, both Scripture and Confession declare, confirm each other in so far as both exclude all merit of our works and permit nothing to reign but grace. But can this prevent the eye of God from looking to faith, which is nothing but the living and moving of a poor sinner in the grace of God? Does not the Bible say clearly: "Without faith it is impossible to please God"; and: "Lord, Thy eyes look to faith"? (Are not Thy eyes upon the truth? Jer. 5, 3.) Should this looking for faith, this consideration of faith be excluded from the act of election, because everything in us is to be excluded as a merit of works, the same necessity would exist in justification and in the bestowal of salvation. In that case God could never look for faith nor require it for the purpose of deciding anything in matters of our salvation. And I am ready to believe that the leaders of Missouri so understand the matter that human faith does not determine at all who shall be justified and saved in time, and who shall not, but that faith is merely the instrument which God employs, in order to carry out and execute His absolute decision. If God from eternity has decided absolutely who shall be restored to grace, sonship, and heirship without regarding or requiring faith, why should He be obligated to look for faith or to require it now in time, in order to decide what to do with sinners? According to Missourian methods of reasoning faith can impossibly be a factor in God's decision, as to who shall be justified and become His child and heir. God cannot possibly recognize

a merit of works now in time(!) which before time began He rejected in the act of election, therefore He pays absolutely no heed to either good or evil conduct when instituting that great separation among sinners through His elective decree, but merely makes use of His absolute sovereignty (alias grace), thus electing whomsoever He pleased.

As far as the Formula of Concord is from teaching: We are justified alone by grace, without merit, according to the purpose and pleasure of God in Jesus Christ, wherefore it is not faith that makes the difference with God or separates between those whom He actully desires to justify and those whom, in spite of their perfect redemption in Christ, He does not desire to justify; so far also is the same Symbol from making similar deductions in the doctrine of election, never having a thought of denying that it is the future believers as such whom God has decreed in His eternal counsel, for Christ's sake, to restore to grace, sonship, and the inheritance of eternal life. On the contrary, the Formula of Concord brings out with perfect clearness the complete harmony between these two articles also in this respect.

In the third article: "Of the Righteousness of Faith before God", the Formula of Concord repeats and emphasizes time and again that it is "faith that receives the grace of God and the merits of Christ offered in the promise of the Gospel as a gift of God, whence (unde) we obtain reconciliation with God, sonship and heirship of eternal life." It says that, according to St. Paul's doctrine (Rom. 4, 6), we receive salvation "in just the same way as righteousness" (eodem prorsus modo); "yea, that precisely by this means, when we are justified by faith, we receive adoption and heirship of eternal life and salvation." (Phila. ed., p. 579.)

Precisely the same is taught by the Formula of Concord also in the eleventh article, where, according to its definition of election in a wider sense, an appropriate place, in the general chain of the Eternal Purpose relative to human salvation is assigned to the selective, separative decree, by which sonship and heirship are conferred. The well known eight points are so many requisites (requisita) of election in the wider sense, so many grades (gradus), on which the act of election, in accordance with the purpose of divine grace (John 3, 16), progresses in regular order, until it is consummated in election unto the infallible attainment of eternal glory. The foundation, the grace of God and the merits of Christ bear, beyond a doubt, the whole superstructure; for

God's Word, sacrament, repentance, faith, hearing of prayer, perseverance, are altogether operations of grace by virtue of His order of salvation established upon the foundation of the universal redemption of Christ for all men without distinction. The foundation, therefore, is universal and consequently conditions from the outset the gracious purpose of God and, corresponding with this, the possibility for all men to be saved through Christ, and to be received unto sonship and the inheritance of eternal life in exactly the same order, manner, and method, just as they all have been redeemed by Christ.

Where the Formula of Concord treats of the order of salvation established for all men, according to which all men could and should have been elected and saved, it does not introduce the elective decree among the common multitude of sinners standing, without distinction, before God's eyes without repentance and faith: These or those persons, in this common multitude, shall now (without regarding faith and repentance) be elected to sonship and salvation for the sake of Christ, and shall on this account be preordained now unto repentance and faith. That would be nothing but the Calvinistic "review," which the Formula of Concord in its whole presentation rejects and combats. For this Calvinistic review has its initial stage in the fallen promiscuous multitude, and its last in the unfailing enjoyment of the blessings of salvation. No; where the Formula of Concord indicates the general order of election, according to which God 1) desired to ordain unto salvation all men, without distinction, and according to which 2) the elect have actually been ordained, it is stated clearly and unmistakably that God, in His eternal counsel, has decreed and acted according to no rule but this, "that He was pleased to justify, to receive into grace, sonship and inheritance of eternal life all those who, in true repentance, would apprehend Jesus Christ through faith."

This and no other was the order of election, which has been revealed in the Gospel for the benefit of all men, and according to which all can and should seek in Christ the eternal election of the Father. Away, therefore, with all devilish, pernicious thoughts of a review held among men while still in the same condition, according to God's mere absolute authority: "This one shall be received into sonship, heirship, repentance, faith and salvation, this one shall not." Away with that doctrine which sends forth fiery clouds of satanic darts by producing the

impression that God, without regard to His universal order of grace, and, therefore, without regard to repentance and faith in Christ, has simply selected here this, there that sinner, and for this reason ordained only these and no others to the whole way of salvation with all its stages. Away with this absolutism, away with this Calvinism, this spectre of an election embracing only certain sinners as such and hovering over them as an entirely undisclosed mystery without regard to the revealed order for conferring sonship and heirship! Woe to those who seek to smuggle back into the Church this Calvinistic spectre which was expelled from the Lutheran Church by this very Formula of Concord!

The Formula of Concord teaches, to be sure, that God, alone of His great grace, without our merit or good works, elects, justifies and saves sinners, according to the purpose of His grace and pleasure in Christ, so that it is wrong and false when, in this respect, a cause of election, justification, or salvation, is placed in ourselves. But the Confession does not thereby deny, like Missouri with its questionable deduction, that believers in Christ as such are the only persons who, according to the purpose of divine grace in Christ, have been lifted out of the common multitude of sinners. The Formula of Concord itself gives us this assurance, partly in so many clear words, and partly by definitely stating the principle, that "by grace alone" in no wise conflicts with "through faith," but rather confirms and includes it.

Or shall we presume that it has not been the intention of the Formula of Concord, in the fourth paragraph, to especially characterize and mark those sinners, with reference to whom God in His eternal counsel formed His decree concerning sonship and heirship? Is the phrase: "All those who in true faith apprehend Jesus Christ" an equivalent of: "certain persons" or certain men? Should the Formula of Concord refrain from connecting the separation of the elect from the non-elect with the difference existing in time between believers and non-believers? Should, according to the Formula of Concord, the discretio personarum (separation of persons) into those who are to be saved and those who fail of salvation set in arbitrarily where all sinners stand before God's eyes as a promiscuous multitude without faith? The Formula of Concord clearly declares who is included in the elective decree for sonship and heirship, namely all those who, "in true repentance and right faith apprehend

Jesus Christ," as it is written: "As many as received Him, to them He gave power to become the sons of God." It states with equal explicitness who is to be excluded from the separative decree of the Father, in accordance with His purpose, declaring that we should "seek in Christ the eternal election of the Father," namely because the Father has resolved in His eternal counsel "to save no one except those who acknowledge and truly believe in Christ." This separative election, this selective decree dividing mankind into heirs and non-heirs embraces logically none but believers in Christ as such, and, for this reason and only for this reason, it excludes from the saving blessing of the eternal election unto sonship and heirship all those who, in time, do not believe in Jesus Christ. In this way "by grace alone" and "according to the purpose of His grace and pleasure in Christ" remain standing firmly and irrefragably on the one hand, and on the other hand the equally necessary and scriptural, "all those who apprehend Jesus Christ in right faith." To be sure, the merits of Christ are to be entirely sundered from our works, and the honor for our election, justification, and salvation is to be given alone to Christ, but not as if the excluding phrases, "by grace, without the law, without works, not of works," were in contradiction to faith, or excluded the consideration of faith from the saving operations of divine grace. For the Epitome says plainly (Ep. III, 7 and 10): "All these words, taken together, mean that we are justified and saved alone by faith in Jesus Christ." Therefore the phrase, "by grace" or "according to the purpose" sinners are elected means as much as by faith alone, without works and merits of their own, shall sinners be elected and ordained to sonship and heirship. If it had not been the purpose of divine grace, "by faith alone" to decree and receive sinners into sonship and heirship, the unbelief of the non-elect would surely not have been able to exclude them from the decree conferring these gifts. The want of anything which was not considered in the act of election itself can not prevent the carrying out of its provisions. If this is the case notwithstanding, cognizance has been taken in the act accordingly.

If the Confession teaches that the Gospel reveals to all men the order of the election of grace in Christ Jesus by pointing out to them the order of repentance and faith in Christ as the universal way to salvation, the Confession teaches by that also,

that God has actually ordained unto sonship, heirship, and salvation, these and not those, according as He foresaw who would apprehend Jesus, and who would not. God does not deceive us with His revealed order of election, but in His elective decree really follows His universal order, of which this is a chief article, that only those who apprehend Jesus shall become heirs of God and heirs of salvation. The proposition, "God has ordained in His elective decree to elect to salvation all those who believe in Christ and no one else" is practically equivalent to the other, "God has elected only such sinners to sonship and heirship of whom He foresaw that they would believe in Christ." The Confession, therefore, nowhere rejects the idea that God's eternal foreknowledge had its place in the counsel of election, but merely maintains that we men should not deal with the mysterious side of the act of election, nor seek to make sure of our election by speculating about things that are hidden in the depths of the divine foreknowledge. Together with all others we are to cling to the universal order of salvation which has been revealed in the Gospel, and are to seek our salvation in that. God's foreknowledge makes no change in this fixed order, nor does it add anything, neither does it take anything away, but merely applies this order to the whole human race, even where its course lies among incomprehensible judgments and unsearchable ways.

The great aim of the eleventh article is manifestly to present the ordination of all believers unto sonship and heirship, which has been revealed in the Gospel, as the only side of the mystery of election which is conducive to our comfort and advantage, and to vindicate this truth against all attempts to dabble in mysteries. This is the trend of the whole arrangement and of all subordinate sections illustrating the chief thought. In the fourth paragraph especially this central principle is enunciated in clear words: Ordination unto sonship embraces believers only.

Here we might conclude, but we think it appropriate to bestow a little attention upon Missouri's abuse of the Formula of Concord.

VI.

According to our promise we have the duty of furnishing proof that Missouri is guilty of misusing the Confession by endeavoring to prove from it her theory of the election of grace.

We confine our attention to the chief point, the idea of election unto sonship and the inheritance of eternal life.

That this election (Auswahl, ekloge, electio) is a separation (separatio, segregatio) of certain sinners from the whole multitude for the purpose of exclusive salvation, is a self-evident truth, which, at this day, is not called in question by any one. The question is merely as to the underlying principles of this separation. When the Calvinists said that this separation is arbitrary, unconditional, absolute in its relation to men, our Lutheran fathers replied: "No; this separation has taken place in and after the consideration of future faith in Christ." When the Calvinists further contended: "But faith is a free gift which God bestows upon whomsoever He pleases", they would answer: "To be sure, faith is a gift of God, but He holds up faith to all the called and is willing to give it to all; however He does not coerce the acceptance of this gift, inasmuch as faith is not wrought in an irresistible manner, nor by irresistible force, but through certain ordained means which man is to use, and through a power of grace which man is able to resist.

This doctrine the Calvinists rejected as Pelagianism. According to that view, they held, the conduct of man is a cause of salvation, and God has had regard to human conduct, partly in the predestination of salvation, partly in the execution of the order of salvation, thus letting the actual execution of His gracious will depend upon the desire of the person called, to be, or not to be, saved. But by that the sole efficacy of grace has ceased to be recognized and the doors are opened to Pelagianism. No proof is necessary that Missouri, in this respect, does not walk to-day in the footsteps of our Lutheran fathers, but in those of the Calvinists. The fundamental idea in its system, in as far as Missouri can be acknowledged to have a system at all, is no other than that of the Calvinists: Unconditional, absolute grace, not merely as regards the universal benevolence of God, which, in the nature of the case embraces all men, but also as regards the operations of grace upon the individual, or the complete execution of the order of salvation. Just as arbitrary, unconditional and absolute as is universal grace, so also the application of the several elements of the order of salvation is alleged to be for the elect—but only for the elect!

Our Lutheran fathers never wavered in maintaining the truth, that the separation unto salvation closely corresponds with,

and reflects, the universal order of salvation. Lutheran theology at that time knew nothing about a twofold counsel, or about a counsel and a purpose as two different things. Only one counsel of salvation was known, namely that which is the same for all men; and a constituent part of this counsel was, according to our Lutheran fathers, the purpose to save all those who perseveringly believe in Christ and besides them no one. They gave prominence to the revelation of election in the Gospel, which concerns all men and discloses to all the way of salvation, a revelation which has received clear expression in the disclosure of the purpose that all men who accept, by faith, the Son of God as their Savior, and none besides, shall be heirs of salvation. This universal purpose they used, in the presentation of the elective decree as the major premise; the foreknowledge of actual faith in time as the minor premise; and from these two, the universal purpose and the foreknowledge of faith, they drew the conclusion embodying the elective decree proper: These individual persons (the individual foreseen believers) shall be elected to eternal life in preference to the rest (prae caeteris). In the nature of the case foreknowledge on the part of God implied an element of liberty on the part of man, namely the liberty of coming to faith and persevering therein through the grace of God the Holy Ghost proffered in the call, or, foreclosing the way to the Spirit of grace through wilful malice and of preventing His performing His work. Our fathers taught both that the call of divine grace, owing to its universal sufficiency, enabled not alone the elect but all the called to be converted and saved, and, in the second place, that all the called, and not only the non-elect, can if they so choose, reject the call of grace without restraint and hindrance, and thus forfeit and lose their souls' salvation. And since God neither saves the former by an irresistible grace, nor offers the latter a kind of grace which really is insufficient, therefore, the called are confronted by the great choice, either to permit their salvation according to the universal order of salvation and by the means prescribed therein, or to reject and frustrate, in the free use of their liberty, the counsel of salvation which saving love has conceived. This being so, God, in eternity, was constrained to see and inquire beforehand what each individual called would do in time and how he would conduct himself, in order to preordain in His eternal purpose, according to His fore-

knowledge, who among the called should be the elect. And thus it was that many were called, but few chosen.

At no point this fundamental principle of the doctrine of election as held by the fathers, is so sharply emphasized as in the stress which they unceasingly laid upon the distinction between the antecedent and subsequent will of God. In this distinction the very marrow of the difference between Calvinism and Lutheranism has been brought out. Therefore the Calvinists have hated this distinction from the beginning and considered it a fundamental heresy. In the nature of the case this is also the misfortune of Missouri. For, in the first place, to reject all consideration of the attitude of men in matters pertaining to their salvation, and then to distinguish between an antecedent and a subsequent will in reference to the subjects of salvation, would be a contradiction too plain and manifest for Missouri to father, in spite of its penchant for mysteries and contradictions. It prefers to take recourse to the miserable subterfuge, that this distinction applies only to the non-elect, since God desired the salvation of these also, but desired to decree and do things differently notwithstanding, on account of their evil conduct.

That this is nothing but a miserable subterfuge, can be seen from the fact that the antecedent will of God, according to which God wills that no one should perish, is the same with reference to all men. In as far as God wills that all men should be saved, He wills it in reference to all in the same manner and order of means, no exception being made in favor of, or against, any one. This antecedent will must either exclude, in reference to all, any consideration of their conduct, or presuppose, in reference to all, a certain consideration of conduct as a preliminary condition of its execution.

Either God says to the elect in virtue of His antecedent will: I promise you my grace for your conversion and salvation in such a way, that I shall pay no attention whatever to your attitude toward the call of my grace; I shall absolutely and unconditionally, convert and save you under any consideration. But if God says this to the elect according to His antecedent will, He says it to all men, and the great Missourian mystery resolves itself into this, that God says one thing and does another. Missouri, in this matter, brands God as a liar. It makes Him first promise to all men, according to His universal saving grace, that He wills to save them all of His grace, that means without regard to their

conduct, and afterward it lets Him become entirely unfaithful to His promise, when the fulfillment is to receive tangible shape. For God does not save all men of His grace in the Missourian sense, namely without regard to their conduct, for, in the case of the vast majority, He so strictly regards their conduct that, on account of it, He neither wills nor grants their salvation.

But if God, on the other hand, has told the non-elect: "I earnestly desire your salvation, but I do not exclude by the bestowal of my saving grace all consideration of your attitude toward the means and order of my grace, but rather beseech and exhort you, that you should willingly adjust yourselves to the order of salvation and persevere in the same till the end."—if, I say, God has spoken, in this fashion to the non-elect, in virtue of His antecedent will, and promised them their salvation only in this limited and conditional sense, He has said the same precisely to the elect also, and deals with them according to the principles here enunciated. God is faithful: He has neither promised anything to the non-elect which He afterwards regretted, nor has He, from the outset, promised more to the elect than to the rest—as far as His antecedent will is concerned.

This is the main point which brings out the shameful abuse our Confession has suffered at the hands of Missouri.

When, in the year 1879, we were asked by Dr. Walther to present our side in the predestination controversy in the form of theses, then already attention was called by us to this main point. Our third antithesis had at that time already the form here given: "It is of the greatest importance for the scriptural presentation of the doctrine of the election of grace, that we pay strict attention to the distinction between the antecedent and subsequent will of God's grace, or to the universal and particular will of God, since the latter, as the proximate cause and norm of election in the narrowest sense, is based upon the divergent conduct of men toward universal grace."

Since that time Missouri has not ceased to declare that the fathers are really quite in accord with her, but the fact remains nevertheless that she has rejected the distinction between the antecedent and subsequent will of God as made by the fathers. For if Missouri had admitted this distinction as correct, it would have been compelled to abandon its whole theory. No more decided contradiction can be conceived than that which exists between the well-known distinction of the fathers and the Mis-

sourian doctrine concerning the election of grace. The very thing the fathers decided to teach by their distinctions, Missouri rejects emphatically as an effort at mediation, Pelagian in character. And what the fathers rejected, Missouri desires to teach, namely an unrevealed and irreconcilable mystery standing between the universal will of grace and election in the narrow sense.

The Formula of Concord already teaches most positively what the fathers tried to teach by using this distinction, what Missouri, however, looks upon as the heretical a b c of all synergistic-Pelagian doctrine. The Confession maintains 1) that God's will respecting the salvation of sinners (antecedent will) is universal from the outset; 2) that God, in a certain sense, wills to save only the elect; 3) that these two wills of God are not contradictory wills of God (contradictoriæ voluntates), but that the subsequent will quite naturally flows from the antecedent will, being, as it were, the application of the same. Indeed the latter is not applied without the consideration of the conduct of men, otherwise the elective will would embrace all men like the antecedent will. That the two expressions "antecedent" and "subsequent will" are not found in the Confession, only a partisan Missourian can adduce as an argument to substantiate the claim that the matter itself is not found there, or that it is a departure from the Confession or even in opposition to it. The fathers of the Formula of Concord themselves have given currency to the expression and vindicated it again and again by recourse to the Confession composed and signed by themselves, preeminently Selnecker, and the Wittenberg and Wuertemberg theologians. A person could say with the same right that Luther did not know anything of this distinction, though he writes clearly and plainly: "Therefore quite a different meaning must be found in the saying: Many are called, but few are chosen. For the preaching of the Gospel is general and public and intended for whosoever is willing to receive it. And God has it preached generally and publicly for the purpose that every man should believe, receive, and be saved by it. But what is the actual result? We are told afterward in the Gospel: 'Few are chosen' ; few so conduct themselves toward the Gospel that God is well pleased with them; for some hear it and do not esteem it; some hear it and do not hold fast to it, refusing to do or suffer anything for the sake of it. Some hear it, but

pay more attention to money and goods and sensual pleasures. But that does not please God, and He does not take pleasure in such people. That is what Christ calls, not to be 'chosen,' namely not to conduct oneself so that God could take pleasure in him. But these are the elect, in whom God takes pleasure, who diligently hear the Gospel, believe in Christ, prove their faith by its fruits, and suffer on account of it what providence has ordained." (Hauspostille, Sept.)

The way of salvation includes all the stages of the order of grace from the proclamation of the call of grace up to glorification. The question is, has God in His final decree respecting the carrying into effect of this whole order, in any manner, taken into consideration the conduct of the called? We answer with our fathers Yes. Missouri replies with the champions of Calvinism No. It appeals to the Lutheran Confession, but in so doing becomes guilty of grossly abusing this Confession.

In order to prove this conclusively we need refer only to one point, for instance the free use of the means of grace both for the purpose of coming to faith and of persevering therein. The simple question is: Has God willed to decree the sure conversion and perseverance of all men without taking into consideration their conduct toward the means of grace? without first inquiring how the called themselves will conduct themselves in this respect? Surely not, we answer. Missouri teaches so, it is true, but the Scriptures and the Confession do not.

In the second article of the Formula of Concord the proposition is dwelt on at some length that, in the question of conversion, not only purpose, effect, and the means for the work must be taken into consideration, but also the manner of our conduct toward such means, as to whether we rightly use them or not. Special emphasis is laid on the liberty that even the unregenerate sinner has as regards the prescribed use of the means of grace, in being able to submit to the gracious operation of the Holy Ghost at least outwardly, or in withdrawing himself from this operation entirely. The eleventh article also refers to this point repeatedly and even explains the particularism of election (that only few are chosen) "that so many of the called" (note: not all) "foreclose to the Holy Ghost the ordinary way, so that He can not effect His work in them." (Ep. XI, 11; Decl. XI, 34-42.)

God, therefore, in His final decree as to who shall be con-

verted and come to faith and who not, has been very strict to look and inquire how the called themselves will conduct themselves toward the ordinary means (media ordinata). This is not to be understood, as Missouri sometimes perverts the matter, as if we looked upon such conduct as a meritorious or efficient cause of conversion; but God wants to save His reasonable and personally responsible creature only by such means as man can either freely use or spurn. According to His antecedent will God wills the conversion of all men through these means; but according to His subsequent will, which makes the final decision, He actually wills to convert only those individuals who use the ordained means in the prescribed manner. The limitation embraced in the subsequent will or decree of God is based upon the fact that God has left it to the liberty of the called either to use the ordinary means, through which alone the Holy Spirit is pleased to operate, or to push them unused aside. This will of God with its deferential attitude toward the conduct of men presupposes on man's side, in the very nature of the case, a corresponding conduct toward the means of grace as an absolute condition of actual conversion. The conception of the order of salvation, just as that of resistible grace, involves, therefore, a certain consideration on the part of God of the free conduct of man as that of a reasonable, personal creature gifted with a sense of his volition and responsibility. Such a creature is not to be saved by coercion and force, but in a manner corresponding with the divine plan of salvation. The third article does not subvert the first, nor does it set the first aside.

Still greater prominence is given in the seventh point of the teaching of the Formula of Concord to the fact, that God, in His will and decree, in conformity with the provisions of the order of salvation, has regard to man's conduct, which is the correlate of his liberty as a responsible person. We read in so many words concerning the last link of the elective chain, or glorification: "That the good work which He has begun in them, He would strengthen, increase and support to the end, if they (Si modo) observe God's Word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness (grace) and faithfully use the gifts received." (Phila. ed., p. 653.)

This one sentence is sufficient to break the neck of the claim of the Missouri doctrine, that it harmonizes with the Symbol. If a chain consisting of so many links is to have a certain amount

of strength, every link must have the intended amount of strength. If there is only one link in the chain which lacks the required strength, whether it be the first or last or one of the centre the whole chain lacks the required strength. For the strength of a chain is determined not by some links which are possibly very strong, but by the weakest link in the whole chain. The several stages of the order of salvation, now, as enumerated in the well-known eight points, are a chain consisting of so many links. But the election of grace extends as a final, irreversible decree of election over all these stages. Whoever, therefore, maintains, that this election of grace as a whole has taken place without any consideration of the conduct of the called, maintains by that at the same time, that there is no section in the whole way of salvation, in which their conduct has been considered with reference to their salvation. For if anything had depended upon the conduct of man only in one link of the chain, for instance in conversion or in perseverance, it would be folly to predicate of the whole chain of divine election that, when it was forged, consideration of man's conduct had not been welded in as a constituent part. That would be the same, as if a man would maintain, Yes this one link is frail and weak, but that does not affect the strength of the whole chain, it is a very strong chain in spite of the weakness of one of its links.

The application is easily made. The decree of glorification is an individual link in the chain of decrees which the Formula of Concord combines under the name of predestination or election of grace. If, therefore, election as it is completed is looked upon as having taken place without regard to the conduct of the called, the same would, of necessity, be true of each link of the chain, also of the decree of perseverance and glorification. But if it is not true of this one decree — if at least this one decree has not been formed without certain regard being had to the personal conduct of the regenerate — it is false doctrine and nonsense, to maintain of election as a whole that it has taken place without regard to the free personal conduct of the called.

And Missouri may wriggle and twist itself as long and as much as it pleases, in order to wrench away from this Si modo ("if only"), like a pike from the line of the angler, it can not and shall not tear itself loose. It may use all sorts of sophistry and arbitrary interpretation in order to free itself from the fine but strong point of this "Si modo," it will all be of no avail.

The Formula of Concord teaches and recognizes at least the last link of the chain of election as involving a condition and as pertaining to the personal conduct of the regenerate. This at once decides that the Formula of Concord does not teach and confess of election as a whole that it is unconditional, that means without consideration at any point of the conduct of the person called. For election as a whole includes also the last link. If this involves a condition, election as a whole is conditional on account of this one link. The weakness (condition) of the last link, conditions the weakness (condition) of the whole chain.

It may be that we are not able to explain this matter as clearly to others as it is to ourselves. But it is certain that the Formula of Concord does not teach, as regards conversion and perseverance, that God has firmly and finally decreed the actual subjective experience of these blessings without reference to the free personal conduct of the called toward the same, which is exhibited in their use of the means of grace. And in this the Formula of Concord stands as sharply opposed to the doctrine of Missouri as any two doctrines or principles can stand in opposition to each other. If, therefore, Missouri appeals in defense of its theory to the Confession, there can only be one result, namely gross abuse.

Quod erat demonstrandum.

A TESTIMONY

AGAINST THE

False Doctrine of Predestination

RECENTLY INTRODUCED BY THE

MISSOURI SYNOD:

ON THE

Basis of the Scriptures and of the Lutheran Confession,
by Several Former Members of the
Missouri Synod.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN,
THE INTRODUCTIONS AND THE FIRST FOUR THESES
BY

REV. R. C. H. LENSKI, A. M.

THE FIFTH THESIS AND THE APPENDIX
BY

REV. W. E. TRESSEL.

And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.

2 THESS. 2, 11-13.

A TESTIMONY

AGAINST THE FALSE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION RECENTLY INTRODUCED BY THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

On the 11th of October, 1881, the Revs. H. Ernst, J. H. Doermann, H. P. Duborg, C. H. Rohe, P. H. Holtermann, and A. H. Wetzel, who, together with others, had left the Missouri Synod on account of its false doctrine of predestination, issued a "call", "inviting all pastors and teachers who had left the Missouri Synod on account of its new false doctrine, and who were located in northwestern Indiana, in Wisconsin, in Illinois, or south or west thereof, to assemble on the 16th of November, 1881, in the congregation of Rev. H. P. Duborg at Blue Island, Ills., for the purpose of discussing and forming an organization (which, as was presumed, would unite with the Ohio Synod as a separate district). All congregations holding the same faith with us, in a situation similar to our own, and lying within the territory described, are likewise requested and invited to send accredited representatives to this meeting."

As a result of this call the following persons assembled: —

PASTORS.

H. A. Allwardt of Lebanon, Dodge Co., Wis.
J. H. Doermann of Yorkville, Kendall Co., Ills.
H. P. Duborg of Blue Island, Cook Co., Ills.
H. Eisenbach of New Douglas, Madison Co., Ills.
H. Ernst of Michigan City, Ind.
H. Fisher of Maple Works, Clark Co., Wis.
P. H. Holtermann of Mount Olive, Macoupin Co., Wis.
G. Mochel of Shelbyville, Ills.
C. F. Seitz of Columbia City, Ind.
A. H. Wetzel.

TEACHERS.

J. H. Meyer of Blue Island, Cook Co., Ills.
Baumann of Michigan City, Ind.

DELEGATES OF CONGREGATIONS.

Jno. C. Niemann and
H. Prange from the congregation at Mount Olive, Ills.
H. Baier from the congregation at Yorkville, Ills.
H. W. Rinker from a small congregation which had separated from the Missouri congregation in Hebron.

The following were present as guests: Students of theology G. W. Nicol, F. H. Patzer, vicars of Rev. Duborg, and the Messrs. Gottfr. Kircher, H. A. Reiner, Stoffel, R. Boe, and Rohe. Rev. J. M. Johannes of Ephraim, Door Co., Wis., sent in a written request for membership for himself and for his congregation.

Besides this a number of letters from pastors and laymen were sent in, heartily favoring the purpose of the meeting. Revs. Rohe and Lange in Michigan and P. F. Eirich in Hoboken, N. J., who had also left the Missouri Synod or had been expelled, being outside of the territory described, did not attend the meeting.

The Conference was opened by Rev. Duborg on the 16th of November, at 1:30 P. M., by the singing of hymn 136 and the reading of the first section of the 119th Psalm. Rev. Doermann was then chosen permanent chairman of the meeting, Rev. Wetzel secretary, and Rev. Mochel chaplain.

It was resolved that the Conference continue its sessions, if necessary, until Tuesday evening, and that the sessions be held from 8:30 till 11:30 A. M., and from 2 till 5 P. M.

The chairman hereupon made a brief address. He stated, that the faith of the heart will certainly find it necessary to show itself in a confession of the lips, according to the word of David: I believe, therefore I speak; and according to Christ: Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father in heaven; and according to Paul: With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. Moreover, it is certain that we cannot define our position in the present condition of affairs too often or too precisely, since our opponents use every means to make it appear as though we had turned from the Word of God and from the Confession. Nevertheless, at present it seems advisable to postpone our doctrinal discussion until the formation of a synodical organization, according to the call that was sent out, has been discussed. Nearly all present were agreed to this proposition. Several congregations had sent representatives for this very purpose, and a number

of letters encouraged the project most heartily. But over against this it was stated, that the time between the issuing of the call and the meeting of the Conference was too short to admit of bringing the matter before the congregations in the proper manner. Then too, after all the calumniations and misrepresentations of our doctrine at the hands of our opponents, it certainly behooves us to state clearly and precisely what we teach concerning God's eternal election, and what we reject in the doctrine of our opponents, so that our fellow Christians can themselves know whether we or our opponents have forsaken the pure doctrine. The discussion of a synodical constitution would require so much time, that we would hardly be able to begin the discussion of doctrine. It was thereupon unanimously resolved: —

That we postpone the definite organization of a synod until the spring of 1882, so that the entire time of the present meeting may be devoted to doctrinal discussion.

All present were also agreed that the organization to be formed should properly unite with the Ohio Synod, since this Synod had been in fellowship with the Missouri Synod for years, and is thus one with us in all other doctrines, and since this Synod has now also remained true to the Lutheran Confession in the doctrine of predestination, while Missouri has become untrue to the Confession.

The entire time of the Conference was thus devoted to doctrinal discussion, from Thursday morning until Tuesday noon, nine sessions in all. Those present found themselves in perfect agreement with each other. During the course of the discussion the Revs. Holtermann and Mochel were chosen as assistant secretaries, and the final editing of the minutes was placed in the hands of the Revs. Ernst and Allwardt, who also furnished the theses for the discussion. Rev. Allwardt was requested to add to the minutes, in the form of an appendix, a sketch of the former doctrine of Missouri on predestination and a brief history of the present controversy.

INTRODUCTION TO THE DOCTRINAL DISCUSSION.

After Prof. Schmidt, of Madison, Wis., and Rev. Allwardt had raised objections in private to Dr. Walther against the Report of the Western District of the Missouri Synod for the year 1877, the latter did not, at the meeting of the same District in 1879, con-

fine himself to a defense of the controverted propositions, but attempted in every possible way to brand the contrary propositions as heretical; this the Report of '79 shows only too fully. When for this reason a public defense of the pure doctrine became necessary, and open controversy ensued, those of St. Louis continued this procedure. On the one hand, they declared that we did not believe at all in an eternal election, and on the other hand, they asserted especially that our doctrine concerning conversion was synergistic and Pelagian, i. e. that we ascribe co-operation to man in conversion. This is the old trick; "Catch the thief!" cries vociferously the thief himself. These accusations they have repeated and re-repeated with a zeal and an emphasis worthy of a better cause; and there is no doubt that so far their success has been due to the employment of such tactics. For every Lutheran believes firmly that we cannot by our own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, our Lord, or come to Him, and that faith is the gracious gift of the Holy Ghost. He who denies this is indeed no Lutheran; and our opponents could have employed no more efficient means for calumniating our controversy against them, and for withdrawing attention from their own errors, than this terrible accusation. It was not very difficult for them to secure acceptance of these accusations especially in their own synod. The respect accorded Dr. Walther was in itself of great weight. Few people read what we ourselves wrote, and the misrepresentations of our doctrines at the hands of our St. Louis opponents were such as in themselves to prevent any calm and unprejudiced investigation.

Our present intention is not the defense of our good name over against the calumniations of Missouri. We cannot deny indeed, that it pains us to have so many of our former brethren and fathers in Christ look upon us now as heretics, synergists, Pelagians, arch-Pelagians, and even as pagans and Turks. Yet we have the testimony of a good conscience. And we see also to what fallacies they must resort to give any support to their accusations, and that they dare not present to their readers passages of any length from our writings from which a judgment migh be formed. From conversations with many Missouri pastors since the inception of the controversy we know that it was almost impossible for them to swallow the new doctrinal propositions, and they dare not even to this day present them openly and honestly to their congregations. These are indeed miserable condi-

tions, and we can only thank God for having preserved us and strengthened our hearts to fight against the error. The aspersions cast upon us we can bear readily, knowing that a day of just judgment is drawing nigh.

Our purpose is simply to raise our united voices in warning: Beware, O Lutheran Church of America, beware! Missouri, so highly favored and blessed — Missouri with Dr. Walther at its head — has fallen into great error, into an error which affects the very foundation of our salvation — God's eternal love for sinners. Missouri indeed comes with an indignant denial. And, in fact, it does not explicitly deny that God has loved all men, that the Son of God has redeemed all, and that God in a certain sense would have all men to be saved. Missouri confesses all this, and often clothes it in beautiful words, finer than we are able to produce. And yet by the side of this its teaching Missouri adheres to a doctrine of predestination which in very fact annuls the universal love of God. Missouri itself confesses that apparently the doctrine of predestination contradicts the doctrine of God's universal will of grace; it tells us that the connection between these two doctrines is a mystery; and under cover of this "mystery" it seeks to establish this doctrine in the Church. Beware, O Lutheran Church! This "apparent" contradiction is a real contradiction, a contradiction of the fundamental doctrine of the Scriptures, namely that God had such compassion upon all men as to render the salvation of all in reality possible. When our opponents speak of the universal will of grace, they still for the most part speak correctly; but when they speak of predestination, their words are false. Paul tells us that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. But our opponents have mixed the truth of the Scriptures not with "a little", but with a good-sized lump of error.

Would to God that they might learn to see and forsake their error! But the prospects for such a course on their part are not very encouraging. We commend all to God!

THE BLUE ISLAND THESES.

I. God has irrevocably elected unto salvation before the foundation of the world all those who are saved in time.

II. Election is revealed in the Scriptures, and is therefore no more "a mystery" than any other article of faith.

III. Election is revealed in the Gospel and not in the law.

IV. The Gospel directs us to Christ — God has elected in Christ.

V. Christ's merit is considered in election not merely as obtained for us, but also as apprehended by us — God has elected in view of faith.

THESIS I.

God has irrevocably elected unto salvation before the foundation of the world all those who are saved in time.

There is agreement between our opponents and ourselves on this thesis; this is what they teach, and what we teach. And it is easy to establish this thesis from the Scriptures and from the Confession of our Church.

The Lord declares, Matth. 20, 16, and 22, 14: "For many are called, but few are chosen". Here a choice is explicitly predicated, and this choice does not include all men, not even all men who are called, i. e. who hear God's Word. It cannot include those who do not even hear God's Word. Eph. 1, 4, we read: "According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world." In 2 Thess. 2, 12, Paul declares: "That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." In contrast to these words he says concerning believing Christians: "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." In fact, these two passages contain the whole doctrine of predestination in all clearness, so that among those who abide by the Word in simplicity there can be no dispute regarding it. All those who do not believe the truth (when it is preached to them, for by nature no man believes the truth, that is the gospel) are damned, and are therefore not elected. And in accordance with this statement the apostle says of the elect, they are chosen in belief of the truth. God indeed desires to save all men, yet never without belief of the truth; without faith it is impossible to please God. Accordingly, He has elected no man without faith, but only in faith. The whole difference in eternal election turns on belief and unbelief, and thus the doctrine of election agrees perfectly with the universal preaching of the gospel: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned. And when the question is raised, how God could take the faith or unbelief of individual men into consideration when men were not yet in existence, David furnishes the answer in Ps. 139, 16: "Thine eyes did

see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them." If God saw us all when as yet we were not, He certainly also saw which of us would believe in Christ His Son through His grace, and which would continue in unbelief in spite of that grace. God chose men who live now, and rejected others who live now. For His divine omniscience all things are neither past nor future, but forever present. Hence Peter declares that those who believe were chosen according to the foreknowledge of God (1, 2), so that God had all men as they are now before His eyes; and as He has chosen no one without faith, so He rejected no one who does not wilfully remain in unbelief. Some are damned because they do not believe the truth, the others are chosen in belief of the truth.

But this is precisely what Missouri does not want. Missouri claims that God did not consider faith in His eternal election, and yet He divided men; that He saw all men, as we are born, in the same blindness and misery, and that then He chose a certain number and resolved to give them faith and keep them therein. Hence they pervert the clear declaration of Paul, saying: God has chosen some unto faith, instead of in faith. God then from the very start passed by the majority of mankind. This is the real point at issue in the present controversy. But Missouri drags in instead of this a dispute concerning conversion.

But this is anticipating. The chief point in the first thesis is this, that already before the foundation of the world God has chosen those who are actually saved; and this is clearly established by the passage: God hath chosen you from the beginning unto salvation. Those, however, who do not believe the truth are damned, and therefore are not chosen unto salvation. Rom. 8, 29, reads: "Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son." The word in this passage is not "chosen", but "predestinated" that they should be conformed to the image of His Son, i. e. suffer here with Christ and be lifted up to glory beyond. Yet God did not predestinate all men unto glory, but only those "whom He did foreknow", that is a certain number, a select number. The word "predestinate" shows that the election is immutable; for it does not designate the gracious will of God which desires to bring all men unto faith and salvation, but a fixed decree concerning those who believe; and since the word is "fore-known", and in the original also "pre-

destinate" (fore-ordain), the eternity of this foreknowledge and predestination is expressed.

Our Confession contains the same unmistakable utterances concerning God's eternal election. In the Formula of Concord, Art. XI, § 5, we read: "But the eternal election of God, or predestination, i. e. God's appointment to salvation, pertains not at the same time to the godly and the wicked, but only to the children of God, who were elected and appointed to eternal life before the foundation of the world was laid, as Paul says (Eph. 1, 4-5): 'He hath chosen us in Him, having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ.'" In § 23 we read: "And that in His counsel, purpose, and ordination He prepared salvation not only in general, but in grace considered and chose to salvation each and every person of the elect, who shall be saved through Christ, and ordained that in the way just mentioned He would by His grace, gifts, and efficacy bring them thereto, and aid, promote, strengthen, and preserve them."

These and other passages of the Scriptures and of the Confession establish our thesis beyond a doubt. And as there is no dispute between us and our opponents on this score we might at once proceed to the second thesis. But we find it necessary to state here that they have again and again accused us as though we denied God's eternal election, and thus flagrantly rejected the above testimonies of the Scriptures and the Confession. The false accusation, that we teach, man is able to do something on his part for his conversion, together with the other equally false, that we deny predestination altogether, has been the chief means of deceiving their readers in regard to our doctrine. This chapter in the controversy is lamentable indeed; it is by no means a pleasant task for us to expose such proceedings, nor complimentary to ourselves that people with whom we have hitherto been intimately connected care so little for truth and honesty. But since they make use of such calumniations and open falsehoods to undermine our testimony for the truth, thus drawing the attention of the church away from their false teaching, we find ourselves compelled by the truth which is at stake to make mention of these disagreeable things.

Even before the Conference in Chicago (October, 1880) they accused us of believing in no eternal election at all. What we designated as election they claimed to be nothing but God's foreknowledge—this was one of their assertions; another was, that

we took the universal counsel of grace to be election; or that we taught two elections, one universal, and one particular; and finally, that in reality we taught only one election of all men. Here are four tunes to one song. Let us look at the last one. It is evident that, if we would teach an election of all men, we would indeed deny election proper; for where all are taken there can be no election. To demonstrate this is, accordingly, very easy work for our opponents. The only question is, where have we made the statement that all men are elected? We have never said this, nor have we ever believed it. Yet we have asserted, and do still assert, and will demonstrate thoroughly in the following pages that our F. C. uses the word election in a wider sense than the later teachers of our Church.

Our opponents have fastened themselves upon this expression, "in the wider sense", claiming that we thereby mean an election of all men, and thus in reality no election properly so-called at all. The case is this: Our F. C. enumerates eight eternal decrees of God, and only in the last of these and in a further concluding sentence is any mention made of the selection of persons. And yet the Confession states before and after that all this must be taken together when we speak or think of election. It is evident, too, that election cannot be properly understood or conceived unless we think and speak of it in connection with the universal redemption, the call through the Gospel, conversion, justification, etc. All men are sinners; how could a holy God predestinate them unto salvation? Answer: He had already determined to redeem them through Christ. Even a child can understand that redemption belongs to election. But why did not God predestinate all men unto salvation, why did He choose only a few? Did not Christ redeem them all? To be sure, He redeemed them all. But according to God's order the individual can become a partaker of this redemption only through faith. Our Confession declares: God in His eternal divine counsel determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him. Just as little now as God gives salvation in time to an unbeliever, so little has He elected unbelievers in eternity unto salvation. But no man can believe in Jesus Christ or come to Him by his own reason or strength; God must give us faith, otherwise we would remain forever in unbelief and condemnation. Hence, it is evident, that the decree of redemption is not sufficient to constitute election,

it requires in addition all the provisions of God relative to our conversion, justification, and preservation in faith. And this indeed is the contents of all the decrees, from the second to the seventh, enumerated in the Confession. All these decrees therefore belong to election, i. e. all this God Himself had to ordain, if He desired to receive sinners unto eternal life. The word "election" indeed, taken literally, signifies a separation or division; but we are here considering the election of sinners unto salvation; and these must be sinners redeemed and justified through faith.

There is, however, another side to the necessity of these decrees for the proper understanding of the doctrine of election, namely in answering the question already touched upon, why God did not predestinate all men unto salvation? Without faith, as has been stated, God would save no one. On the other hand, He excludes no one from salvation who dies in faith. Faith is of the greatest importance; and the inquiry, why God did not predestinate all men unto salvation, leads of necessity to the further question, why all men do not believe, and why all do not persevere in faith who believe for a time? God alone can give and preserve faith. Is it His fault then that all do not believe?

The answer is found in the decrees treating of the bestowal and preservation of faith, namely the second, the third, and the seventh. Their language is clearly such as shows that God has excluded no one from the gracious operations of His Holy Spirit, and that on the other hand He also compels no one with irresistible power to believe or to persevere. The fact, that all do not believe, is not due to a lack of divine grace; and this thought necessarily belongs to the correct conception of election. It is true that God chose only a "few"; but we must not forget that the cause of this is not a twofold and dissimilar will on God's part. Our Confession also, as we shall see, brings this out in a number of places, and with great emphasis. But these eight decrees already teach as much, and therefore belong necessarily to the idea of election.

This is what we mean when we say that the F. C. employs the word election in a "wider sense"; we do not mean that the Confession teaches an election of all men; "in the wider sense", not so as to include more men, but so as to include more divine decrees than the mere separation of persons. For although the decree of redemption and vocation pertain to all men, the eighth

decree does not pertain to all. Redemption and vocation alone do not constitute election or predestination unto salvation. The latter embraces all that precedes it. An elect person is a sinner redeemed, called by the Gospel, justified in faith. For this reason the eighth decree, which treats properly of the final predestination to salvation, declares, "that those whom He has elected, called, and justified He would eternally save." But if we turn it about, redemption and vocation do not include the selection of persons for salvation; there are many redeemed and called who are not chosen. We can therefore speak of redemption and of the call without speaking of election; on the other hand, we cannot speak of election without speaking of redemption and of the call, or without at least mentally presupposing them.

Our fathers frequently compare this entire series of eternal decrees to a golden chain. The anchorage of this chain is God's eternal grace; the first link of the chain is the gracious decree of redemption; the second link the calling through the Gospel unto the blessings of redemption; the third the efficacious power of the Holy Ghost in conversion through the Gospel; the fourth the justification of the converted; the fifth the renewing of the justified, so that faith and a good conscience may abide in them; the sixth the support in all affliction and persecution, that we may not despair of the goodness of God; the seventh the preservation proper in faith; the eighth finally the glorification of those in eternal life who have been preserved in faith. This is truly the contents of the eight decrees presented by the Confession. All can see that one link always joins the other, so that we cannot speak of a single one without at least referring to its connection with the one preceding. We cannot speak of the call without mentioning redemption, or at least presupposing it as well known. The last link in the golden chain, as we have seen, is the predestination of certain persons unto salvation. And accordingly, we cannot speak correctly of this link without describing all the rest fully, or at least presupposing them all. If the last link is removed from the chain, it indeed remains an iron or a golden ring, but it is no longer a link in the chain. In the same way, if we attempt to speak of election or predestination unto salvation, without in some way showing up its connection with the other provisions of God, the word "election" would indeed retain its literal signification, but its biblical meaning would be

lost; for the Bible knows nothing of an election unto salvation except on the basis of Christ's merit and in belief of the truth.

It is for this reason that our Confession declares that, when we wish to speak correctly and profitably concerning election, we must comprise with it and never omit or exclude the entire doctrine concerning the purpose, counsel, will, and ordination of God pertaining to our redemption, call, righteousness, and salvation (§§ 24 and 14). For election contains this, and all this belongs thereto (§ 9).

The purpose of our Confession in this, namely the consideration of election in its connection with the universal counsel of grace and in the light of this counsel, can be secured in a twofold way. One is, that all the separate decrees of the counsel of grace be set forth part by part, with the decree of the glorification of the elect at the end; the other is, that we treat of the last decree by itself, but not without carefully showing its connection with the foregoing decree. A single link in a chain may be examined separately, as long as its connection with the one immediately preceding is kept in view. If this is omitted, it is no longer looked upon as a link of the chain, but only as a golden ring; the real idea and intention of the artist is altogether overlooked. As far as the one link possesses peculiarities of its own, which we desire to examine especially, it is possible to view it separately only bearing in mind its junction with the foregoing. And this is the difference between the F. C. and the later teachers of our Church, between the use of the word in the wider and in the narrower sense.

The F. C. presents the entire chain; the dogmaticians only the last link in its connection with the foregoing, they say that God has chosen and predestinated all those unto salvation who believe perseveringly in Christ. They say nothing about the origin and preservation of faith in their definition of election; all this they presuppose. Nevertheless, persevering faith remains the link between the universal counsel of grace and the election of persons. It is easy to see, that thus nothing has been changed in the decree itself or in its relation to the rest, and that our dogmaticians have no doctrine of election different from that of the Confession; yet they use the word "election" in a narrower sense, to describe only election proper, while the F. C. includes the other provisions which precede this election.

This difference in the mode of setting forth one and the same thing is what we mean when we speak of a wider and of a narrower sense of the word "election." We by no means intend to say that in the "wider sense" all men, including those who die in unbelief, are elected.

Our opponents, however, found an excellent opportunity in this for calumniating us; for it is evident that unlearned people, who do not know that these two modes of doctrine have been customary in our Church, can easily be persuaded that election "in the wider sense" must necessarily mean "an election of all men." Those of St. Louis could well know that such was not our meaning, for we were not the ones to discover this distinction, a large number of our theologians having always employed it, and among them also Baier in his Compend of Dogmatics, according to which Dr. Walther has been instructing his students for 25 years. Dr. Walther assuredly knows that book, and one should suppose that the other St. Louis professors, as also all pastors who studied there, likewise know it. This book states at considerable length that the word "election" in the F. C. is used in a wider sense than that commonly employed by the dogmaticians, but it nowhere intimates that according to the F. C. all men are elected "in the wider sense." Our opponents, therefore, had no right whatever to impute such a nonsensical notion to us.

Moreover, in the very beginning of the controversy we made a clear statement ("Altes und Neues," February, 1880) and printed both definitions from the text-book of Dr. Walther so that no one could mistake our meaning. Notwithstanding this, our opponents at once caught up the expression, election "in the wider sense", and proclaimed to all the world that we meant an election of all men.

But if there was no shadow of excuse for this shameful misrepresentation in the beginning, its constant employment later on is even more criminal. At the Conference in Chicago (October, 1880) we were at once met with the accusation that we were teaching an election of all men. We declared most emphatically that we did not believe such an election, and that we had never taught it. (See the Minutes, p. 14, 15, and many others.) Dr. Walther finally admitted: "One may indeed speak of predestination in the wider and in the narrower sense, and under certain circumstances we must speak of it so" (Minutes, p. 18). These

are his own words! We can therefore, and under certain circumstances we must, speak of predestination in the wider sense. Can Dr. Walther mean to say that under certain circumstances we must teach that all men are elected? Surely not; the phrase, "election in the wider sense" therefore cannot have this meaning. But when we now "under certain circumstances" use this expression, and declare time and again that we do not mean an election of all men, Dr. Walther none the less declares that this is our meaning and the sense of the expression, and 700 pastors chime in without hesitation.

After Dr. Walther confessed that this expression can be, and under certain circumstances even must be, employed, there was only one question requiring answer, namely: Does the F. C. use the word election in the wider sense? This question we answer affirmatively, and our opponents negatively. We substantiated our answer from the clear declarations of the Confession in § 13-24; our opponents would not acknowledge that this passage contains the description proper of election, but attempted to compel us to take § 5 as the proper description; but § 5 does not say at all what election or predestination unto salvation is, what is comprised in it and what it contains, it merely states to whom it pertains. But we will speak more fully about this later on. We now demonstrated to them that they themselves had already acknowledged in § 13-24 a "complete definition of God's eternal election." This passage contains the eight decrees. In the Report of '79, pp. 51, 52, 53, and 88, they had declared that these 8 decrees are not predestination, but simply contain something that must also be preached; the thing itself, predestination, is not found there, but in § 23. (Now they tell us it is found in § 5; like blind men they grope about in the F. C. foolishly.) We then directed our opponents to the declarations of the F. C. both before and after the eight decrees, stating explicitly that all this must be taken together and included and nothing thereof omitted. Thereupon they admitted in "Lehre und Wehre," May 1880, that the entire passage does contain a complete definition. "A definition," however, states what election is and what belongs to election. Whereas formerly they denied that the eight decrees were "the thing itself," they then admitted that the eight decrees were the thing itself or belonged thereto. They themselves, therefore, had spoken of election at first in the narrower sense, and afterwards in the wider sense. They still

sought to hold fast their false doctrine. But this one point, that the eight decrees belong to election, they had admitted to us already previous to the Chicago Conference, and this and nothing but this is what we and all our former teachers in the Church mean by the expression "election in the wider sense."

When we continued to point to this admission at the Chicago Conference, Dr. Walther replied: "When attention is drawn to the fact, that not only on the side of our opponents differently sounding definitions have been given, but also in our publications (writings of Missouri), as for instance that the eight propositions belong to election, it is certainly remarkable that people otherwise acute should not (so to say) with half an eye see what is so simple even for a child to comprehend. When it is said, they do not belong to election, a strict definition of election is meant. When it is said, they do belong to election, an extended description of election is had in view." Minutes, p. 26.

This is the way in which Dr. Walther covers his retreat. This is the way he extracts himself out of a difficult position in the midst of a fog, instead of honestly surrendering when beaten with his own publications! "Strict definition" is what he terms it, and this is precisely what we mean with the expression "in the narower sense"; and "extended description," or as "Lehre und Wehre" had it "complete definition" is nothing but election in the wider sense. And the difference is precisely as stated by Dr. Walther, in the one case the 8 decrees are included, in the other case they are not.

Dr. Walther, therefore, could not escape, he had to admit the validity of our distinction; in fact he was compelled to use it himself to explain the different expressions of his own adherents.

But now he gave the matter a turn, as though we had attacked this distinction on his part, whereas he had constantly reviled us for adhering to it; he is surprised that we cannot comprehend what is so childishly easy, and what he himself always could and desired to comprehend. Instead of honestly confessing: Yes, dear brethren, in this point you have been right! he pretends to have always been right himself while we failed to comprehend it! The prisoner is to be put into the cell; at the door he turns suddenly about and pushes his friend of the police in, locks the door, and marches off with the key! That is Dr. Walther — we so-called opponents have made his acquaintance!

But this is not the worst of his procedure in the matter.

After declaring, when proof was submitted to him from his own publications, that what he had controverted all along was easy even for a child to comprehend, one would suppose that afterwards he would be silent about it. But what did Dr. Walther do? Four or five months after the Conference he wrote his first tract about the predestination controversy, and in this he brings up again the same old accusations, that we teach an election in the wider sense, and that means that all men are elected! He never says a word to show that "under certain circumstances" one may use this expression, and even must use it; never a word that he and his adherents had at times included the 8 decrees in discussing the F. C., and at times had excluded them, and that thus they themselves had actually spoken of election in the wider and again in the narrower sense, and that they had been cornered by this at Chicago. And now that he knew most emphatically (if indeed he had not known all along) that we did not mean an election of all men in using this expression, he still lays this foolish notion at our door. In fact, this shameful perversion, this open sin against the eighth commandment, is the very kernel of the whole tract, is at least one blade of the shears with which he attempts to crush us. It is only necessary to look at the tract to see this; on page 7 he says: "On this their (our) assertion, that the F. C. speaks of predestination in the wider sense, rests their entire doctrinal structure. With this their assertion, if true or if not true, stands and falls everything they affirm or deny in distinction from ourselves."

Let Dr. Walther's words be noted; he declares that if the F. C. speaks of predestination in the wider sense — that is, according to his own explanation, if the 8 decrees "belong to election" — then everything stands that we have affirmed and denied over against St. Louis! This, for one thing, is an excellent testimony in our favor, although of no avail against St. Louis itself; for these our opponents will never surrender, but continue to invent new subterfuges. But of this we will say nothing further here.

But now, in order to convince his "beloved readers" that our assertion is not true, he points them to the fact, that the F. C. declares clearly and explicitly, election pertains not at the same time to the godly and the wicked, therefore does not embrace all men. Election in the wider sense would be, he declared, an election of all men. Accordingly, every Lutheran

Christian can see that the F. C. does not speak of election in the wider sense, and that we therefore have fallen away from the Confession. It may appear incredible that Dr. Walther should say this after what had taken place in Chicago; but here are his own words.

Tract, p. 8: "If any one desires to force upon you the doctrine of a so-called predestination in the wider sense, pertaining not only to the elect children of God who are ordained unto salvation, but to the godly and the wicked at the same time" etc.

Page 10: "But how intelligent people can say: The F. C. indeed declares explicitly in the beginning that election does not extend to the pious and to the wicked, but pertains only to the elect children of God, yet it speaks of predestination in the wider sense, which pertains to all men" etc.

Page 10 and 11: "They (we opponents) employ all the logical skill and acumen possible to demonstrate that the first main proposition does not say, or does not mean, what it says, that it speaks indeed of election which does not pertain to all men, but that it means none the less an election which does pertain to all men, for it speaks of an election in the wider sense!"

It is in this manner that Dr. Walther works upon his "beloved Lutheran Christians" by means of open falsehoods, which have been shown to him repeatedly to be such! In this manner he perverts and reviles an expression which he himself found necessary in Chicago, to which he was compelled to resort in order to explain "definitions differing in sound" among his own followers! He knows that we do not hold what he accuses us of; he knows that our dogmaticians had no such notion, and surely he should know whether he himself had the notion when he himself used the expression. But what of it? He simply desires to crush by this means our contradiction of his false doctrine, so that he may brand us as having fallen from the Confession. The argument suits his object exactly, every "beloved Lutheran Christian" can comprehend it. The Confession declares: Election does not pertain at the same time to the godly and to the wicked; these miserable opponents, however, say: The Confession uses the word election in the wider sense. And that this means an election of all men Dr. Walther can of course readily tell people who have not read our utterances and do not otherwise know the expression.

This, however, characterizes the tactics of our opponents throughout. Their writings against us overflow with misrepresentations, perversions, and sophistical conclusions. P. Stöckhard alone forms an exception, having atttacked us indeed as sharply as the rest, but always endeavoring to understand our true meaning. Many of the misrepresentations resorted to are not as gross as the one mentioned above, but more skillfully introduced, and yet not a whit more honest. Their entire demonstration seeking to prove us synergists is all of the same sort.

We introduce a few more of the grosser misrepresentations.

Our opponents had appealed repeatedly in substantiation of their error to Dr. Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans, and we had shown them just as repeatedly that they did not understand Luther's words correctly, and that their appeal to these words was therefore useless. The thing was so plain that Dr. Walther found it necessary to publish a kind of retraction or explanation. But in this he represents matters as though we ourselves had assailed Luther's words and had blamed him, namely Dr. Walther, for having quoted these words of Luther. In "Lehre und Wehre," 1881, 49, we read: "We consider it a disgrace for our Lutheran Church that so many, who pretend to be members of this Church, now speak of Luther's words as though Luther, whom they too praise as a Reformer, has been a horrible heretic, so that the mere use of his words already creates the suspicion of heresy."

Is not this another skillful trick? We had demonstrated that Luther's words are perfectly correct. We had blamed Dr. Walther for misinterpreting the words — finding fault not with Dr. Luther, but with Dr. Walther; Dr. W., however, so turns things as to make it appear that we had branded Luther as a "horrible heretic" and had found fault with him, Dr. W., for even having used Luther's words.

Evidently, if he could raise the suspicion in the minds of his readers that we agreed neither with the F. C. nor with Luther, he would gain much for his own cause. But we do not envy the success he may reap by such means; we only lament that he can so far forget himself and work so much harm in the Church, and that the host of pastors in the Missouri Synod is either so idiotic or so conscienceless as to submit quietly to such tricks.

We indeed teach that election or predestination pertains only

to the children of God, but we also teach that this election took place on the basis of the universal counsel of grace, and that it can be studied and presented only in intimate connection with this universal counsel. The universal counsel of grace belongs to election as surely as the foundation walls of a building belong to that building. It is true indeed that several of the provisions or decrees of the universal counsel of grace pertain to all men; but it does not thereby follow that the last of these decrees also pertains to all. Redemption is not yet election, nor is the call taken by itself. The whole series of decrees can well be summed up in the designation "election", because the last one of them treats properly of the election and predestination of persons and at the same time includes the entire result of all the foregoing gracious works and decrees of God. But if this last decree were left out, the rest could never be called "election." Therefore, the first 7 decrees may apply to a man, but if he does not actually remain in faith till the end, he is not chosen, and election does not pertain to him. And this is a very essential part of the doctrine of election, namely that these seven decrees pertained to him, and that thus he could readily have persevered in faith, if he had not, as our Confession declares, himself wilfully turned away.

This serves to explain the two propositions in the Confession, which Dr. Walther seeks to use against us like the horns of a dilemma. The first is the sentence, that election is a cause which procures, works, helps, and promotes our salvation and what pertains thereto. In the 8 decrees we do really find all that belongs to our salvation; and everything there is fully sufficient, so that all can well be saved, and therefore that all could also be elected. Just this is what makes the Confession so excellent and full of consolation. The second sentence is this, that election extends only to the children of God and not to the wicked; for those of them who do not "hear and ponder" the Word at all are not "converted to true repentance," as the 3d decree declares, and therefore they do not accept Christ in true repentance through right faith, hence they are not justified, nor received unto grace, unto adoption and inheritance of eternal life. Those, however, who indeed through the grace of God believe for a time, yet become indolent and secure, neglect the Word of God, do not pray diligently, do not abide in God's goodness, and do not use faithfully the gifts received, are not pre-

served in faith according to the 7th decree, but fall away and thus lose again "the adoption and inheritance of eternal life" which they received in justification. They, therefore, are not predestinated to be eternally saved and glorified in eternal life. In short, all the previous decrees may have pertained to them, but this last does not from which alone the whole can be termed "election." For this reason election does not pertain to any of the wicked.

In conclusion we would state again and emphatically that "election in the wider sense" and "election in the narrower sense" are not two different elections; there is only one election, namely the one designated in the 8 decrees. But the word "election" is used differently; at one time to designate only the separation of persons, and indicating the connection with the universal counsel of grace by the expression, "in view of faith", or by words of like import; and again, to comprise the entire counsel of grace, the whole of it being designated by the word election. The persons of whom it is predicated that God elected them to eternal life are precisely the same in both instances, namely the children of God. But the provisions of God, without which there could be no children of God at all among sinners, are fully stated in the one instance, while in the other only the connecting link of faith is indicated. Will not our St. Louis friends finally take a better view of the matter?

Another and a more well known example of a word used in a wider and in a stricter sense is found in the word "Gospel." This too has occasioned a similar controversy in the Church. The 5th Art. of the F. C. points out "that the term 'Gospel' is not always employed and understood in one and the same sense, but in two ways, in the Holy Scriptures, as also by ancient and modern church-teachers." At one time it is used to designate only the glad tidings of Christ, and this is its special and strictest sense. Then again it is used to designate the entire Word of God, inclusive also of the law; this is its wider sense. When it is used in this wider sense, we can well say that the Gospel rebukes sin; but when it is used in the stricter sense, it would be altogether wrong to say that it reveals and rebukes sin. Now, several theologians had found such expressions in Luther, and declared that Luther taught, the Gospel as strictly defined reveals sin. That was false doctrine. And our opponents proceed in precisely the same way as far as the word election is concerned. Our

Confession declares that election is a cause which procures, works, etc., our salvation and all pertaining thereto. That is perfectly correct, when we remember that here the word election is used in the wider sense, namely so as to include the preaching of the Gospel, the power of the Holy Spirit, etc. But our opponents deny that this is the case, and still they persist in saying that election is a cause of our salvation, etc. Just as those of old denied that the word "Gospel" can be used to include the law, and still asserted that the Gospel reveals sin—thus ascribing to the Gospel proper the work of the law—so now our opponents deny that the word "election' can be used to include the universal counsel of grace, and still claim that election procures, works, etc., everything, also for example faith—thus ascribing to the selection of persons the work proper to the universal counsel of grace, namely the calling, justification, and preservation in faith. Yet it is easy to see that this produces dangerous false doctrine, the very doctrine of Calvinism, that God from the start has passed by the majority of men—as we shall see more fully further on.

All can see how important it is that our opponents be controverted in this error. We have already heard from Dr. Walther's own tract that, if our assertion in regard to the wider sense of the word election in the F. C. is true, all that we have affirmed and denied in distinction from our opponents must stand, i. e. our entire contention in the controversy is correct. Most assuredly, our assertion is true; they have not overthrown it and never will. When they object in the Report of '79: "Is vocation election? Is justification election? Is glorification election? Never; on the contrary, those who are elected receive all this"—the very same can be argued against the use of the word Gospel in the wider sense (when it is meant to include the law): Is the first commandment gospel? Is the second commandment gospel? etc. But such objections will never change the fact, that the word "Gospel" has been used in a wider and in a narrower sense, and yet there are not two Gospels but only one.

THESIS II.

Election is revealed in the Scriptures, and is therefore no more a "mystery" than any other article of faith.

The discussion was as follows:—

The entire Gospel is originally a mystery. No man knows aught of it in himeslf. It is different in regard to the law. This was written in man's heart at creation, and this writing has not been wholly obliterated by the fall. It is found in the heathen, who have not the written law and yet retain some knowledge of right and wrong. Rom. 2, 14-15.

To be sure, this knowledge is exceedingly imperfect. Man does not know original sin, nor does he perceive that unbelief and all sinful desires are sin. Paul tells us: I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But now when the law condemns "lust," this strikes the natural heart. Even reason can to some extent understand that, if it is sin, for instance, to commit murder, it must also be sin to have the lust of murder. In brief, the law and its demands and curses find a certain echo in the natural conscience; to be sure, an echo which only serves to intensify the enmity against God.

The Gospel, however, was not written in man's heart at creation. Man indeed could not help but know that he owed obedience to his Creator. This is self-evident. But it is not self-evident that after he had fallen away from God, he would receive mercy from God. God owed man no mercy, it was His perfect right to condemn us altogether; it is a perfectly free determination of His will to rescue us. Man, therefore, could of himself know nothing of this, not even before the fall; we have learned this only by divine revelation. It is for this reason that Paul calls the Gospel a mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, Col. 1, 26.

It follows from this that the Gospel finds no echo in the natural heart. It will, therefore, in spite of all preaching in a certain sense remain a mystery for all those who are not enlightened by the Holy Spirit. They may learn all the articles of faith from the Scriptures, but that these things are divine wisdom and

truth they will not comprehend. For the Jews the Gospel is an offense, and for the Greeks it is foolishness. In this sense the Gospel continues to be a mystery still, "hid", 2 Cor. 4, 3, from the prudent and the wise, Matt. 11, 25.

But the mystery is now revealed in the Word and is known by believers. Matt. 11, 25; 1 Cor. 2, 10-16; etc.

This is sufficient to show in what respect articles of faith may be called mysteries. A mystery not revealed in the Word can be no article of faith. How shall they believe what they have not heard?

Reason, to be sure, raises questions about all the articles, which are not answered in the Scriptures; but these questions do not concern faith. What we are to believe is clearly revealed, so that we can read it in the Bible and understand the connection of the different articles. One article of faith always casts light upon another. The article of justification by grace for the sake of Christ's merit through faith is the sun of the Scriptures, illuminating all the rest, so that none can be correctly understood without it. Baptism, for instance, "works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives eternal salvation to all who believe this, as the words and promises declare." No man understands this correctly without knowing that Christ has obtained forgiveness of sin, life, and salvation for us, which is now offered, given, and sealed to us in Baptism.

In the sense described the article of God's eternal election is also a mystery, yea to a certain extent the sum of all mysteries, embracing all the rest, as we shall see. But this article is also a revealed mystery, otherwise it could be no article of faith. Our Confession therefore declares: "This—eternal election—is not to be investigated in the secret counsel of God, but sought in the Word of God, where it is also revealed." Epit. XI, 6. Again: We are to think and speak concerning election as "the counsel, purpose, and ordination of God in Christ Jesus, who is the true Book of Life, has been revealed to us through the Word." Sol. Decl. XI, 13. Similar passages occur frequently in the Confession. St. Paul declares: "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Acts 20, 27. Evidently, this includes the counsel of predestination. The same thing is confirmed by all those passages which tell us that the articles of faith are revealed; and that the doctrine of election is an article of faith both of the contending parties admit; but the Scriptures say

nowhere that that election is a mystery in a special sense. Rom. 11, 33, we will consider below.

Our opponents, however, shroud the entire article in "mysteries". The fact, that there is an eternal election of God, they too find revealed in the Scriptures.

But all that pertains to this election: why God elected only a few; why those only whom He did elect, and not the rest; according to what rule He elected the one and rejected the other—all this, they tell us, is not revealed. Whereas the entire Scriptures testify that God "looks to faith" in justification and salvation as it takes place in time, Jer. 5, 3, so that our Confession says directly: "This faith constitutes the difference between those who are saved and those who are damned, between the worthy and the unworthy," Apol. Art. 3. Our opponents aver: In election God did not look to faith. They say: "The rule according to which God in eternity elected and separated is unknown to us." "Lehre und Wehre," 1881, 367. They do not know "why God did not elect the rest," p. 368. In Chicago they were confronted with the statement: Our Confession declares: God in His eternal counsel determined that He would save no one except those who believe in Christ. Dr. Walther replied: "I do not accept this, if you make it the rule of election," Min., 47.

They, then, do not know according to what rule or order God proceeded in election; nevertheless they claim to know that in any case He did not proceed according to the revealed rule: He that believes shall be saved. Election, therefore, would be a mystery in every respect, a riddle, concerning which the only thing known would be that there is such a mystery; just as the heathen know indeed that there is a God, but do not know who and what He is. Missouri accordingly calls election simply a great mystery: "God's eternal election is the wonderful mystery hovering over certain persons", "L. u. W.", 1880, 147. Our Confession also speaks of a secret, unsearchable providence of God; but it keeps repeating and re-repeating that election must not be sought in this secret providence, but in the revealed Word. Our opponents, however, take this secret providence to be election itself, and call it a mystery in distinction from the revealed counsel of God. While they too consider all articles of faith mysteries in the sense described above, that is revealed mysteries, they consider election, in distinction from all the rest a mystery in a special sense.

The essence of this mystery, however, according to all that Missouri says about it, would be found not merely in the fact, that, as they say, we know less about this article, but in the fact, that all we do know of it does not agree with the revealed Word, but contradicts it grossly. According to the revealed Word God earnestly desires to declare all men free from sin and condemnation for Christ's sake, yet only when they believe in Christ. This faith, accordingly, He desires to work in all. Those, however, who resist the Holy Spirit wilfully remain in unbelief, and hence remain under sin and condemnation. According to Missourian doctrine the very opposite has taken place in eternal election. God is said from the very start to have taken only a few into consideration. These few, however, He elected infallibly unto salvation without regard to faith. When a person stops and considers the enormity of such doctrine, he must be astounded at the possibility of introducing such an abomination into the very midst of the Lutheran Church. God, they tell us, in His omniscience saw the entire human race as it now actually exists: all alike depraved in sin, but all also redeemed by Christ. Now, in this condition He is said to have instituted the separation, decreeing for one part of them: These shall and must be saved, to these I will give grace unto faith and perseverance. By this their salvation would then be assured in any case, not through the present order of grace, not through the revealed Word, not through faith, but simply through this mysterious and absolute decree of God. The revealed Word and faith, according to Missourian doctrine, are only the means by which God in time executes His decree. The actual selection of the persons who are saved has in no way depended on faith.

But how about the merit of Christ? The Scriptures declare that all spiritual blessings flow from Christ's wounds and are purchased by Him. Does this apply also to eternal election, which Missouri calls the foremost and highest good? Did Christ purchase this blessing also on the cross? Not according to Missourian doctrine. Our opponents indeed retain the proposition, that God elected for Christ's sake, and that Christ's merit is one cause of predestination. It is hard to understand how they mean this; for it is certain that they do not mean what the words as they stand say. When we say that Christ's merit is the cause of justification, our meaning is that Christ obtained for us the grace by virtue of which we are justified. Can Missourians wish to say

that Christ obtained for us the grace by virtue of which we are elected? Impossible; for Christ's merit is universal; the grace He obtained He obtained for all men. Since eternal election, according to the doctrine of our opponents, is an act in which God did not look for faith, which nowise depended on the faith of individual men, therefore this grace obtained by Christ should have properly belonged to all men, and all should have been predestinated unto eternal life and unto faith. Hence it is easy to see that our opponents cannot mean to say that Christ obtained the grace of election or the election of grace. And if they should say this, it would follow that Christ did not obtain the same grace for all.

Predestination, therefore, would not be an act of God having its foundation in Christ's merit, like justification and salvation in time, nor dependent, like these, on faith. To be sure, this agrees ill with the revealed Word. But more than this. The elect have been chosen according to Missourian doctrine without regard to faith, yet with the provision that, as a result of election, they shall come to faith. Since now election is unalterable, these must of necessity come to believe, and must of necessity persevere in faith. But the Scriptures teach that indeed God alone converts men, gives faith, and preserves it; yet they teach just as emphatically that by wilful resistance men may frustrate this gracious work, and even after their conversion fall away again. God indeed works everything, but not with irresistible power. Since, however, according to Missourian doctrine, God, from the very start and by an absolute decree, predestinated a certain number so that they shall and must in any case come to believe, an irresistible grace of conversion must be maintained for these; for the elect there is no longer the possibility of wilfully resisting the Holy Spirit; if ever they fall from faith through wilful sin, they must again be converted. And so they tell us Christ spoke to Peter: "Thou art one of the elect; if thou lose faith now, thou shalt not lose it till the end, thou shalt and must obtain it again. And Christ says the same thing to all the elect." Report, 1879, 43.

This again does not harmonize with the doctrine of conversion as stated in the revealed Word.

Thus when we consider merely one side, namely what is said of the elect, everything is full of contradiction to the revealed Word. God would have declared them saved without regard to faith; He would have predestinated infallibly unto eternal life a

number of men whom He still viewed as sinners, not as believers, hence not as being justified, but as still the children of Adam; faith would not be considered the receptive hand, but merely one of the blessings which was simultaneously given to these few. This blessing of election would not be obtained by Christ; on the contrary, God would have bestowed it of His own free and absolute will upon whomsoever He wished; and those thus favored would be converted by an irresistible grace. All this is Missourian doctrine, it is not the scriptural doctrine.

Things, however, are far worse when we come to consider the fate of the non-elect. According to Missourian doctrine God did not consider faith in election as He does in justification. The difference which faith and unbelief produce between men would thus have been left out of consideration, and yet God would have excluded the majority of men from the very start from that act of grace from which faith, justification, and preservation, even salvation itself is said to flow, from that act of grace without which everything else is of no avail. Dr. Walther indeed for some time still maintained that God passed these by in election because He foresaw their constant unbelief. But since he denies that God considered faith in the case of the elect, he contradicts himself, or imputes to the God of truth a duplicity which would render any man despicable. When, for instance, we inquire: Why did not God elect Judas? Dr. W. makes the Scriptures answer: Because God foresaw the obdurate unbelief of Judas. And this is perfectly correct and true. But when we proceed to inquire: Did then God foresee, when He elected Peter, that he would not die in unbelief, but in faith? Dr. W. replies: By no means; for then God would have seen something good in man, and to say that would be gross Pelagianism! In the election of Peter, therefore, faith, according to Dr. W., was not a necessary requirement; but in the case of Judas faith was such a requirement, God not electing him because He failed to find this requirement. God foresaw no faith in Peter and yet elected him; God foresaw no faith in Judas and for this reason did not elect him! It is Pelagian and heretical, our learned friends tell us, to consider faith a foreseen requirement for the election of a person. And yet God is said to have followed this Pelagian and heretical rule in non-election. What base hypocrisy is here ascribed to God! If the unwashed guest at the king's wedding feast, having on no wedding garment, had seen a number of other guests, likewise without wedding gar-

ments, but not cast out like himself; if concerning himself the command was given: Cast him into outer darkness, for he has no wedding garment on! while concerning the rest the command had been: Let them remain, for I will give them wedding garments! — would that guest have been able to believe that his filthy dress was the real cause of his rejection? And yet this is precisely what Dr. W. asks us to believe concerning non-election.

Whoever has not been wholly blinded by the fallacies of St. Louis, and rendered unfit to prove doctrine, will see at once that in this case (1) foreseen faith is not the true cause of non-election, but only a pretext, and (2) that in both instances the absolute will of God is the one decisive factor. For God saw the same unbelief in Peter and in Judas, according to Missourian teaching; He could have passed Peter by with the same right as He did Judas. But — He wanted to elect Peter! God saw in Judas an unbelief precisely like that of Peter; He could, therefore, have elected him with the same right as He did Peter. But — —! This is precisely the absolute election of Calvinism, only hidden behind a different phraseology.

The younger fellow champions of Dr. W., however, understand that the foresight of unbelief avails nothing unless the foresight of faith is admitted for the other side. They, therefore, simply say that it is a mystery why God did not predestinate all men unto salvation and unto faith. They know only this, that God saw no difference among men, that the entire difference lies in God.

But what is their opinion about the non-elect? Does God desire to save them all? Is it not true that God loved the whole world and sent His Son "that the world might be saved through Him", John 3, 16? This is indeed the outcome of Missourian doctrine — i. e. Missourian doctrine of election. They themselves declare that the election of only a few unto salvation can not be harmonized with the universal will of grace. A mighty gulf, a deep abyss, an apparent (?) contradiction is fixed between the two propositions: It is God's will that all men may be saved; and: Few are chosen. The chief mystery is here, how these two doctrines agree. But the contradiction between the Missourian doctrine of election and the universal counsel of grace is not only apparent, but real. For Missouri teaches that God made a distinction among men from the very start. Some He chose unto the call and unto faith, and others He did not choose thus; some

He chose according to the Lutheran (?) rule of election (i. e. according to His absolute will), the rest He passed by according to the Pelagian (?) rule of election (i. e. according to a conditional will). Without faith God will save no man; this faith, however, is said to flow from election; unto this faith we must be elected, otherwise we will remain without it. Yet only a few are thus elected; it is evident, therefore, that at best only a few can and shall be saved. This is Missourian doctrine, i. e. Missourian doctrine of election. And this is likewise the genuine Calvinistic doctrine of election.

But Missourians do not wish to be Calvinists, because they find a further doctrine and a doctrine contradicting the former in the Scriptures, a doctrine according to which God wants all men to be saved, according to which He redeemed them all, calls all and that seriously (?), desires to give faith to all, so that the fault will be theirs if they remain in unbelief and fall into condemnation. This is the revealed Gospel. In this doctrine they admit that God looked to faith, and that faith constitutes the whole difference; here faith is indeed the necessary condition and requirement on which depends forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. What is synergism and Pelagianism in the doctrine of election, is here the purest possible Lutheranism! According to this doctrine all men can indeed be saved, and the greater number is not saved because of their obdurate unbelief.

Everybody can see that these two doctrines, the Missourian doctrine of election, and the biblical doctrine of universal grace, which Missouri has not yet thrown overboard, are in direct contradiction to each other. And Missouri itself admits that they contradict each other according to all appearances — not merely as far as our reason is concerned, but one doctrine of Scripture (?) contradicts the other. Missouri teaches two totally different counsels of God in regard to salvation, of which one, and the one which is alone efficacious, extends only to a small minority of men. Missouri denies that the selection of persons constitutes a part of the one and only counsel of God in Christ, and teaches two counsels standing side by side, and differing from each other at every point in that the one is conditioned throughout by the use of the means of grace and by faith, while the other is conditioned by nothing whatever and simply from the very start "guarantees" everything, "executes itself," cannot be hindered, etc.

Thus, for instance, Dr. W. declares, Chicago Minutes, p. 50: "How can that be called election that God foresaw that certain people would believe till the end, and that, foreseeing this, He decreed: These shall be saved? If election is to be no more than God's abiding by His counsel, that all who believe till the end shall be saved, there is no election at all."

Page 51: "I am saved for the sake of Christ apprehended by faith. But where is it written that we are elected on this account?" Let it be noted that Dr. W. rejects the sentence: We are elected for the sake of Christ apprehended by faith. What a tremendous difference is thus made between eternal election unto salvation and salvation as it takes place in time!

Page 47; Dr. W. declares: "I believe that there is no analogy here to justification."

Analogy i. e. similarity or likeness. There is no similarity between predestination and justification! We, indeed, have already seen and said long ago that Missouri with its doctrine of election has left the revealed counsel of God entirely; here we only wish to show how openly they themselves declare this. "L. u. W.", 1881, 341, writes: "Stop that proton pseudos, that justification presents an analogy to election." Proton pseudos signifies fundamental error. Missouri declares it to be a fundamental error to suppose that there is a similarity between justification and election. Yet justification is nothing but the forgiveness of sins, and where there is forgiveness there is also life and salvation. Whomever God justifies He receives by this very act unto life and salvation; and election is also a reception and predestination unto life and salvation. Still there is to be no analogy between the two! We are not allowed to draw conclusion from the one for the other.

This Missourian counsel of election differs in its very essence from the revealed counsel; it has a different foundation, pertains from the start only to a few, is carried out according to an entirely different rule, has altogether different results, and furnishes also an altogether different consolation. For we read in the Chicago Minutes, p. 56: "According to our Confession this saving predestination provides that we remain in faith till the end, and this above all things else is the consolation it contains. It is not that we are saved through faith, for then it would be the identical consolation which we have in God's Word, in the gospel, in Christ's merit, in short in all the means of salvation and grace.

We inquire after the special consolation which is found in this doctrine alone." And page 41: Predestination is "a cause beside other causes, as for instance Christ, God's grace, Word, Baptism, Supper, which also co-operate as causes that the elect may be preserved till the end."

Dear Friends! Yours is another gospel! In so many words you declare that there is a different consolation in predestination than there is in the gospel, in Christ's merit, etc., that predestination is a cause of our salvation aside from Christ, God's grace, etc. That is a different gospel! But though we, or an angel from heaven (or Dr. Walther, or Prof. Pieper) preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed! Gal. 1, 8. In what, briefly stated, does this other gospel consist? Answer: In this that all who believe or think they believe are deceived by the lie, that God has determined something especial concerning them; that repentance and faith are not antecedent conditions of their election, but fruits thereof; that the grace of election will provide that nothing shall separate them from grace, not even the denial of Christ or perjury. Evidently, through such sins they would lose faith, but they shall and must obtain it again, and nothing shall harm them as far as salvation is concerned. This is indeed "another gospel." On the basis of such a gospel our opponents can indeed risk such proceedings as we have seen in the infamous accusations, refuted so often, yet constantly repeated on their part, namely that by "election in the wider sense" we mean an election of all men. Paul writes in Rom. 8: If ye live according to the flesh, ye shall die. But this again is only the revealed counsel of God —.

The great Missourian mystery is this, that God could form two entirely different counsels concerning one and the same thing. And we are "to believe both." If only we could not see the connection between the two, we would indeed, if we found both in the Scriptures, believe both by the grace of God. But, to begin with, we do not find in the Scriptures an election unto salvation without faith and unto faith. And, in the second place, this Missourian notion contradicts the Scriptures so directly that it is impossible to believe both. Persevering faith is said to flow from election. Yet all are not elected. Consequently all cannot believe perseveringly, cannot be saved. God would have established a certain grace said to be absolutely necessary for attaining salvation, from the very start, only for a few, excluding

all the rest without any known reason. The universal counsel of grace, which Missouri still teaches, and by which it imgaines to differ from the Calvinists, is in reality nothing but what Calvinists call the voluntas signi, the seeming will of God, by which He seems merciful toward all, and in a certain sense is merciful, and yet bestows that mercy which really saves from the very start only upon the elect. Ask an honest Missourian whether a person is able to believe perseveringly by virtue of the universal counsel alone and without election. According to the Missourian doctrine that would be utterly impossible. The universal counsel, according to Missouri, is nothing more than God's offer and promise of grace to all, that if they would believe He would save them — if they would believe without the grace of election from which alone persevering faith flows! This is nothing different from the law: If we could do the law, we would indeed be saved. Missouri mocks Christianity now. Its notions are Calvinistic through and through, yet it shields itself behind the Lutheran and biblical doctrine of the universality of God's counsel of grace, by which, however, no man was ever saved or ever can be.

In the earlier part of the controversy they have expressed this openly: "The troubled heart thinks: If God knows that I will be cast into hell, I surely will be cast there, no matter what I may do. The number of the elect can not be enlarged or decreased. What God foreknows must take place. If I do not belong to the elect, I may hear God's Word ever so diligently, be absolved, go to the Lord's Supper, it is all in vain. What does Luther reply? This is certainly so and must be admitted. He invents no other gospel for himself; he lets the sinner stick fast in this truth." West. Report, 1879, 33.

These terrible thoughts of a "troubled heart," i. e. of a true Christian in great distress of soul, are confirmed by St. Louis — not by Luther, as they pretend, but by themselves. Then, however, they refer to the universal gracious will of God as a "general medicine." But it does not appear what they wish to remedy by it in their declaration, "this is certainly so."

This shameful sentence, however, really contains in brief and terse form the whole Missourian doctrine of election. There is no possibility of helping the greater part of mankind; God has denied to them the very first and chief grace from which all else flows, and now all the promises of the gospel are powerless and fruitless; though a man should hear the gospel ever so

diligently and use absolution and the Sacrament, it is all in vain! Calvinists say straight out that God is not in earnest in these universal promises. Missourians say that God is in earnest, but that we may not think that they are too much in earnest, they say that God could indeed remove the resistance of the non-elect just as easily as He does that of the elect, yet why He does not remove it is a mystery. But it remains a fact, that what Missourians call "the universal counsel of grace" has the very same effect as what Calvinists call the seeming will of God. The power which really saves is placed on the part of both into the counsel of election which is said to pertain only to a few. "L. u. W." declares in clear words: "The Word of God and the Confession desire that a Christian derive every spiritual blessing devolving upon him in time from the eternal election of God." 1881, 42. It is plain that this leaves nothing whatever for the "universal counsel of salvation"; and this agrees perfectly with the above utterance: If I do not belong to the elect . . . it is all in vain!

The history of this sentence is remarkable. We have often confronted them with this sentence as one that is thoroughly wicked and overthrows the whole gospel. But what of it? Recall it in honesty? That is hard for them to do, and can hardly be done inasmuch as the sentence contains the real kernel of their doctrine. Its only fault is that it expressed the pretended truth too clearly. In Chicago they replied: "We do not say this; the Report has it: The troubled heart thinks so." It can be seen that they would like to have been rid of the sentence, and attempted to hide themselves behind the introductory words: The troubled heart thinks thus. Even the chairman, otherwise a man of common sense, allowed himself to be decoyed and answered: "That is one of the quotations in a certain paper ('Altes und Neues') which people read and then ascribe to us."

But that was a paltry evasion; for they themselves had adopted the sentence in the words: "This is certainly so." When we attempted to show them this, that same chairman inquired: "Shall we take this matter up now?" and the Conference replied: "No" (see Minutes, 86 and 87)! Let it be noted that by employing false pretense they made this sentence out to be the thought of a troubled heart, that is a fiery dart of the evil one, and accused us of slander for ascribing the sentence to them, and then refused to give us an opportunity of refuting the false imputation. That was the first disgraceful act.

Now a second one. Prof. Stellhorn had confronted them again (in his tract) with this sentence. To this "L. u. W.", 1881, 307 and 8, replied: "It does not seem to disturb him (Stellhorn) to quote the words of a troubled man . . . as though they were our (Missourian) doctrine." "And this he does even now, after having himself received the necessary correction in Chicago."

The shameful procedure in Chicago they dare to describe as a "necessary correction," and brand Prof. Stellhorn as an incorrigible perverter of the truth for ascribing this sentence again to them in spite of that "necessary correction."

And now the third act which serves to crown all the rest. In his "Illumination (?) of Stellhorn's Tract" Dr. Walther very naturally again touches upon the unfortunate sentence, and now he proceeds to defend it as perfectly correct! What his friends in his presence had described as an affliction coming from Satan now all at once turns out to be the purest truth! Whereas they had accused us of falsification in that we ascribed this sentence to them, he now himself adopts the sentence, thus in more than one way abandoning his adherents, — abandoning them most painfully in a matter which he had himself upheld by his silence. It would appear then that they had ascribed a sacred truth to the devil, and that they had wrongfully accused us of falsifying; the "necessary correction" thus appears as having been an unnecessary vilification. Yet in all these proceedings there is no necessity for retracting anything; that would be too much justice towards an opponent.

But it is interesting to see how Dr. W. manages the sentence now reinstated. Naturally, it is difficult work; for the sentence shows up strikingly the double-faced Missourian doctrine by introducing itself in the beginning as a troublesome thought, a troublesome thought coming from the devil himself, and finally comes out as good Lutheran doctrine: "The troubled heart thinks . . . This is certainly so." Here is where the "mystery" lies; according to the revealed gospel the sentence is a lie coming from the devil; for it makes election appear as a naked mustering of men, carried out with an iron necessity, so that he who is elected must be saved, and he who is not cannot be saved — and "Christ, God's grace, Word, Baptism, Supper," which are only "co-operating causes" are all "of no avail." According to the revealed gospel, we repeat it, this is a lie of the devil, and must therefore be looked upon as a "troublesome thought" when

it enters the mind of a Christian — as Missouri preaches it; for the "revealed gospel" declares: God loved the world and gave His Son for it; but after giving us His Son, shall He not also give us all things freely, even also the grace of election, if this be a special grace? The Son, therefore, calls all sinners unto Him, and He is in earnest in calling thus, desiring really that all men may come to Him and receive help from Him; but that all do not come is the fault of their own obdurate resistance. Yet according to the Missourian proposition a man may be ever so diligent in hearing the Word of God, in seeking absolution and the Lord's Supper — that indeed is all that man is able to do, and Christ has promised through this to help us — it is all in vain! Evidently this does not agree — with the revealed counsel; but as far as the counsel of election goes? Of course, that is a different thing! According to this counsel the sentence is perfectly true; this, you know, is the contradiction which the Scriptures do not solve. And thus the two harmonize beautifully: troublesome thought emanating from the devil = Lutheran truth!

The difficulty encountered by Dr. Walther is this, that the "seeming" contradiction is expressed so strongly. Let us see how he proceeds! He handles the sentence in pp. 47-51 of the "Illumination."

He begins by emphasizing that God's foreknowledge cannot err. Dr. W. knows that we do not deny this, and therefore has no cause to make the vicious thrust: "Only a fool will assert this (that God can err) who does not believe in God's omniscience and infallibility."

But when he puts in the sentence: "Must not that take place of which God foreknows that it will take place?" we do not at once answer yes; for the doctrine of omniscience proves only that what God foreknows will certainly take place, and not that it must take place. God foresaw also the fall. Did man then have to fall? Chemnitz, who is Dr. W.'s man, writes: "The infallibility of foreknowledge does not annul the contingency," i. e. although God foreknew with infallible certainty that many would stubbornly resist the Holy Spirit, wherefore also He did not elect them, yet it does not follow thereby that they had to resist Him and that they could not have been saved. All men can be saved, and those who are not saved prevent it themselves, and

this is what God foreknows with infallible certainty. But this is of minor importance.

Dr. W. now continues: "Very well; if now God foreknows which are NOT the elect because they die in unbelief, will then and can such people be saved because they hear God's Word diligently, although without faith, have themselves absolved, although without faith, come to the Lord's table, although without faith? Only an unchristian man, and no Christian, least of all a Lutheran Christian would make such an affirmation. Even Prof. Stellhorn will not dare to make it. For to say that a man of whom God foresaw that he would not believe in Christ to the end, whom God therefore did not receive among the number of the elect, to say that such a man will yet be saved, if only he hear the Word of God diligently, seek absolution and the Lord's Supper, although in unbelief (for only such are here under consideration), that assuredly would be the devil's gospel," etc. WHY, THAT IS OUR DOCTRINE, as all who know the controversy will see at a glance! "A man of whom God foresaw that he would not believe in Christ to the end, whom God therefore did not receive among the number of the elect." Evidently, this declares that God did consider faith in election, that faith (in God's foreknowledge) was a necessary requirement for the election of a man, as well as for justification, wherefore also God did not elect all those "of whom God foresaw" that they would not believe to the end. That is pure Lutheran doctrine, and all we want is for our opponents to acknowledge it. But how does this agree with the Missourian doctrine, that God has chosen some from among the unbelieving without regard to faith, and chosen them unto faith? If God in election saw all as unbelieving, how can foreseen unbelief have been the real cause for not electing the greater number? They all must have been just such people of whom He foresaw that (without election) they would not believe: "of whom He foresaw that he would not believe in Christ to the end"—that was the very man who needed an election unto faith, and now we are told that foreseen unbelief was the obstacle to an election unto faith! The Lord tells us that He has come to call sinners to repentance. How would it agree with this declaration, if some one were to say that the Lord does not call certain people unto repentance because they are sinners? So here: our opponents say in the first place that God elected unto

persevering faith, that is unbelievers; then they say that God did not elect the greater number because He foresaw their unbelief; and again they say for a change that they do not know why God "did not elect the rest"!

The interpretation which Dr. W. gives the evil sentence under consideration does therefore not agree with the doctrine of our opponents on election, nor does it agree with the sentence itself. Dr. W. is compelled to pervert his own former words grossly to remove their gross Calvinistic sense. The sentence states: If I do not belong to the elect, everything is of no avail. ELECTION, THEREFORE, is the thing that is lacking; for, that the man does not believe to the end would be of necessity the result of his having been passed by in election, since persevering faith can flow only from election—according to the Calvinistic Missourian doctrine. The interpretation, however, speaks of God's having foreseen that I would not believe to the end, and of His not having taken me into the number of the elect for this reason, etc. This would turn things about and make the passing by in election the necessary result of foreseen unbelief. The sentence speaks of hearing the Word ever so diligently; the interpretation states that only such are here considered as hear the Word in unbelief. Since when is the attendance of hypocrites at church described as a diligent hearing of the Word? The sentence introduces itself as a troublesome thought; the interpretation, however (namely, if I do not believe, then everything is in vain), is in no sense a troublesome thought, but the simple scriptural truth which must be preached. A Christian may indeed be troubled by the thought: Perhaps God will not keep me in faith. But the evident reply, to this is: "It is not so."

It is, therefore, a forced interpretation which Dr. W. bestows upon his former utterance. What the sentence really states is this, that the Holy Ghost works efficaciously through the Word and Sacrament only in the elect, in such a way that they can believe and be saved. That is the general doctrine of Missouri, and that is what this sentence declares. For this very reason our opponents sought to get rid of the sentence in Chicago and afterwards in "L. u. W.", and assuredly Dr. W. would not undertake to defend it, if the fatal words had not been appended: "That is certainly so."

But for us another thing is of importance, namely that he

himself could find no middle path between the gross Calvinistic doctrine clearly expressed in the sentence and the doctrine of our dogmaticians. He indeed claims elsewhere that there is such a path; but whenever he attempts to outline it, he finds himself either—and this for the most part, for, since he excludes regard to faith, there remains as the rule for election nothing but the absolute will of God—on the Calvinistic road, or, when he does not follow that line, in the wake of our Lutheran dogmaticians, as we have seen in his attempted interpretation. In fact, he concludes his entire explanation with an appeal to all orthodox dogmaticians for the immutability of election, whereas they all prove this infallibility, just as we do, by the fact that God's foresight cannot fail, while Missouri otherwise, like the Calvinists, founds this immutability on the mere decree of the "free" divine will: "These shall and must be saved, and as surely as God is God they will be saved, and besides these none else." Rpt. '77, 24.

If there were nothing but this sentence, we might be satisfied with Dr. W.'s interpretation. But what troubles us is the entire doctrine which has produced this sentence and many others like it. Missouri wants to substitute for the revealed gracious will of God in Christ an absolute will of God as the rule in election; on this our everlasting salvation is to depend. Missouri pretends to let the universal will of grace stand alongside of this absolute will. But when we come to look closely, we find that everything depends on this absolute election, and no man can be saved by the universal will of grace alone. If I do not belong to the elect . . . everything is of no avail. In the case of the majority of men, therefore, everything from the very start is of no avail. This is a desperate doctrine, and the great mystery is represented to be this, how such a desperate doctrine can be harmonized with the exceedingly consolatory voice of Christ: Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. It is not the will of God that any should be lost. This, however, is no mystery, but an open contradiction.

Therefore we say: Away with non-revealed mysteries in this or in any other doctrine! If there are real mysteries, i. e. real truths which it has not pleased God to reveal to us, then they are well taken care of in God's hands, but they do not belong to Christian doctrine. If, however, there are "mysteries" which directly contradict the revealed Word, then they are lies of the

devil. It may look very innocent for "L. u. W." to say: "God's eternal election is the wonderful mystery hovering over certain persons." But what is back of the words comes out clearly enough in another statement: "It has pleased God, as it were, to clothe and enfold the mystery of our election in the preaching of the Gospel and to proclaim and reveal it through this preaching." By this statement Missouri by no means wishes to say that something is revealed to us in the Gospel concerning election itself; on the contrary, the statement means to declare: The fact, that we, we are elected, has been revealed to us in the Gospel; our opponents desire thereby to assert their infallible certainty concerning their own personal election. Otherwise the "mystery is, as it were clothed and enfolded in the preaching of the Gospel." Of course, the absolute will of God does not meet us so nakedly and terribly—it is "enfolded" in the universal promises. The precious Gospel is the casing and the shell for the kernel which from the start is meant only for a few. So also the Chicago Minutes declare, p. 85: "God desires, IF you are to be saved, to bring you unto salvation only by the way of salvation." But how can you discover WHETHER "you are to be saved"? Answer: Hear the Gospel; IF "you are to be saved", it will then become clear to you; IF not, well, then "everything is in vain." But this is to go on an adventure into the Gospel. The Gospel tells me for the very first thing THAT I am to be saved, but, to be sure, "only on the way of the order of salvation." And in this the entire will of God is revealed to me. "This is the will of Him that sent me, that whosoever seeth the Son and believeth on Him shall have everlasting life." This is the will of God, and this is eternal and immutable. In accord with this will God saves believers in time, in accord with this will He has also elected believers in eternity. Besides this will there is only one other, and this likewise a conditional will of God, revealed in the Scriptures: Keep the commandment, and you will live. This condition, however, no man can fulfill. In its very heart, however, this too is nothing but the former will of God: God wants to see a perfect righteousness in those whom He receives unto salvation. This righteousness we sinners cannot furnish, but we find it in Christ through faith. But a will of God, according to which He is said to have received some unto salvation without their either having kept the commandments themselves,

or having become partakers of Christ's righteousness through faith—such a will contradicts the law as well as the Gospel. Our opponents may continue to say that God resolved at the same time to give the elect faith and righteousness. That is only one of their subterfuges. It does not relieve the matter. For although God in the perfection of His being does not thus resolve one thing after another, yet we, according to the Scriptures, can know His will only part by part, and must be careful to note how "one thing follows from and after the other" (Chemnitz). Sin can be followed only by the judgment of condemnation. As long and inasmuch as God sees a sinner as a sinner, i. e. outside of Christ, He cannot and will not pronounce that sinner saved, no matter whether in His omniscience He has foreseen him as a sinner, or (to speak humanly) sees him now—as far as God is concerned this distinction does not exist; He is the same unchangeable God, and sees the same man or the same humanity. But if God could predestinate unto salvation "and unto faith" sinners as such, i. e. unbelieving sinners, who were not justified through Christ, and yet did not predestinate the greater number of them unto salvation, although He saw them precisely in the same condition as the rest, then He would have dealt in both directions according to His "free" absolute will, which is revealed to us neither in the law nor in the Gospel. Our opponents invent an altogether new will of God—and this they call "mystery" and seek to "enfold" it in the Gospel. And this is what we contend against. We will not submit to have the Gospel poisoned.

We draw attention also to this difference: Missouri declares eternal election to be the wonderful mystery which "hovers over certain persons"; our Confession, however, declared that it pertains only to "the godly, beloved children of God." But such things make no difference to Missouri.

To be sure, reason raises many questions in this article which the Scriptures do not answer. When we consider the fortunes of individuals or of entire nations, it does not always appear that God's intention is to bring as many people as possible unto saving faith. But does it therefore follow that He has not this intention? Must we not rather judge of outward appearances according to His Word, instead of vice versa limiting and fitting His clear revealed Word according to outward appearances? There are nations who have not had the Gospel for centuries, and genera-

tions have been born and have died without hearing the name of Jesus. And reason begins to inquire, how it can be true that God desires all men to be saved, when He does not even give all men the means for salvation.

Although we can only reply, that it is nevertheless true, because the Scriptures say so, that God sees an obstacle to His counsel of grace, even though we cannot see it, this is answer enough. The Scriptures say more than this, that God would save all men, they speak also of the order in which alone God would save men, and of His judgments upon those who obstinately despise His order! Paul even speaks of special judgments upon heathen nations who despised their natural knowledge of God. The consideration of such nations, therefore, furnishes us no reason for doubting even a single letter of the precious and indispensable truth so dear to every Christian heart, that God earnestly desires the salvation of all men alike. It is true that we cannot comprehend the individual judgments of God; yet in general we know the rule in accordance with which God deals with the human race. Moreover, the "gulf" is not between the universal will of grace and predestination which is likewise revealed, but between outward appearances and the revealed Word. We see only the superficial surface of the appearances, and cannot therefore judge them correctly. When, for instance "L. u. W." formerly declared: "Experience also corroborates the fact, that God does not remove resistance against His Word in the case of many millions from whom He could remove it just as easily," this is more than "L. u. W." can prove. "Experience" is not God's Word; and whether resistance can be removed just as easily in the case of the one as in the case of the other is something which He alone can by "experience" know whose work it is to remove resistance—the Holy Spirit. Preachers, who are merely His tools in the work, have not this experience, rather the contrary.

But our opponents boldly make statements of this kind, that God deals unequally with men, that He could help all, that all resist in the same way, or would resist in the same way, if God did not anticipate this resistance in the case of some, etc. All this is then brought into connection with election, and then they are surprised at the mysteries!

Well, although we cannot and would not answer the host of

questions they raise, we nevertheless, thank God, know the answer to the chief question; the rule according to which God saves and has resolved from eternity to save one man and not the other — this rule we know. It is this: He that believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believes not shall be damned.

He who goes back of this rule and asserts a separation or division of persons according to a mere will of God, certainly turns election into a "mystery" — a mystery which controverts the entire revealed Word.

Our opponents keep referring to Rom. 11, 33, etc., in proof of their assertion that predestination is a mystery in an especial way: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor? or who hath first given to Him and it should be recompensed unto him again?" Yet the sense of this passage is so clear from the context as also from the words themselves and from other passages of the Scriptures that all doubt is removed. That the "mind of the Lord", or the will of God, according to which He elected some to salvation and did not elect others — that this will is not revealed even in the Scriptures is not proved by this passage, on the contrary, that the mind of God cannot be known without the Scriptures, or in what lies beyond them.

The entire passage from chapter nine to eleven treats of the rejection of the Jewish people and of the reception of the Gentiles. These are the "judgments" and the "ways" of God, as Luther shows in his sermon on Rom. 11, 33. And these judgments and ways are "unsearchable" and "past finding out" in the same measure as "the wisdom and knowledge" of God are deep, i. e. unfathomable. The Jews had rejected the gospel from the beginning, and at the time Paul wrote the letter to the Romans the Christian Church was already separated from the synagogue of the Jews as widely as our Lutheran Church is separed from popery, and even wider. This made it clear even to the Jews that either the Christian Church was false, or that they themselves were no longer the true Church. The latter was, very naturally, claimed by Christians. But this is what the Jews could not understand, they could not "harmonize" it with the promises given to their nation of old. Aside from the fact, that the cross of Christ was an offense to the Jews in any case, they were furthermore confirmed

in their rejection of the gospel by the explicit declarations of the prophets regarding a redemption, renewal, and glorification of Israel by the Messiah, as Paul himself stated in Rom. 11, 26; and now if the gospel were true and the Christians were right, Israel would be rejected — the prophecies would thus be unfulfilled. Their deductions from the Scriptures, therefore, would not explain this "experience" — they were sure that this could not be. Where now were they wrong in their deductions? In this that, being filled with work-righteousness and therefore not enlightened by the Holy Spirit, they failed to comprehend the wisdom and knowledge of God, i. e. the counsel of God unto salvation, namely that God acknowledges as His people, as the children of Abraham only those who have the faith of Abraham. They imagined that the mere descent from Abraham and the obedience under the law made them heirs of the promise, and therefore they could not comprehend the "judgments" and "ways" of God, that they should be rejected and the Gentiles accepted. Against this fleshly imagination John the Baptist, Christ Himself, and all the apostles found it necessary to contend from the beginning. "Think not", says John, "to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham", i. e. God can fulfill His promises even though He be unable to bring you unto them. Paul says the same thing right at the beginning of the entire discussion, 9, 6: "Not as though the Word of God hath taken none effect; for they are not all Israel which are of Israel; neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children, but, In Isaak shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." "Children of the promise", i. e. who are reborn through the promise, who believe in Christ. In the same way Paul writes in Gal. 3, 6. 7: "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham."

This, then, is the truth of God, incomprehensible for reason; hence reason also cannot understand His judgments and ways, since He accepts and rejects only according to this wisdom and knowledge of His.

Concerning this the apostle continues: "For who hath known the mind of the Lord", i. e. who hath looked directly into His

heart? "Or who hath been His counsellor" — so that the "mind" of God would have been derived from our wisdom —? "Or who hath first given to Him and it should be recompensed unto him again" — so that God would owe us something, and we might from that conclude what He has resolved concerning us? In all these instances we would not need a revelation of the divine will, such as we now have, and from which we know that those who are of faith are the children of Abraham.

That the passage referred to does not treat of a secret will of election in contradistinction to the revealed will of grace is furthermore irrefutably shown by 1 Cor. 2, 6-16, where the same subject is treated in the same words, only more extensively. Verse 7: "We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory." Verse 8: "Which none of the princes of this world knew." Verse 10: "But God revealed them (the things He had prepared) unto us by His Spirit." Verse 11: "The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God" (who has revealed them to us). Verse 13: "Which things also we speak"; verse 14: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God"; verse 16: "For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct Him? But we have the mind of Christ." We all see that the same wisdom, mind, etc., is here spoken of as in Rom. 11. But it is the mind revealed in the Word, and not a hidden mystery of election.

All three chapters furthermore show that God proceeded according to this very rule in the rejection of the Jewish people: He who believes shall be saved, he who believes not shall be damned.

Immediately preceding the words referred to in Rom., we read, verse 29: "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance", i. e. God will not become guilty of falsehood as far as Israel is concerned, as they imagine that He must become, if He should reject Israel. — ("Not as though the Word of God hath taken none effect", 9, 6.) — "For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief; even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy." With God there is no respect of persons; as long as ye Gentile Christians did not believe ye did not receive mercy. Now things are turned about; now the Jews do not believe, therefore they now are rejected. Everything therefore depends on faith. "For God hath concluded them all in

unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all." And this now is the "hidden wisdom" of God, that unbelief binds us before God, i. e. renders us worthy of condemnation, and the mercy of God alone, and no work of our own, saves us. And it was this that so offended the Jews; this they could not comprehend; and in regard to this the apostle bursts out in the words: "O the depth" etc.

What is thus taught by the immediate connection we find in all the three chapters. At the end of the ninth chapter, in which occur all those hard sayings (e. g. Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth — Hath not the Father power, etc.), Paul himself raises the question: "What shall we say then? (what is the real meaning of all the foregoing?) That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law." The question, therefore, is not, why God did not elect the Jews "unto faith", but why He did not justify and save them. And this question Paul answers: Because they did not believe. "For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God", 10, 3, i. e. believe not. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth", 10, 4. "Whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed", 10, 11. "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek" (among the Jews, who were then rejected, and the Greeks, who were accepted in their stead). In how far is there no difference? In so far as both were in altogether the same condition, God however taking only the Greeks, and rejecting the Jews, as Missouri would have it? Never! "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." God, therefore, makes no difference; He deals with all according to one identical revealed rule. If then the Jews of that day would not believe (11, 31), they were bound to perish; but if they remain not in unbelief, they will be accepted again (11, 23). So much depended on faith, which St. Louis makes out to be the work of man!

But even then all the Jews were not rejected. "God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew" (11, 2). What does "foreknow" mean? Our opponents say: to acknowledge, elect, etc. But this is wrong; the Scriptures have several words really signifying to elect, and use them when they mean to say "to elect." Even our opponents will not claim that the original signification of "foreknow" (ginoskein) is "elect"; it is rather "to know", and hence here "to foreknow." A strange meaning would result if in the above passage "foreknow" signifies "elect", or if the word "elected" were actually to stand in place of "foreknow." God hath not cast away His people which He elected, would be saying the same as: God does not damn those whom He saves; it would be saying nothing at all, nor would it fit into the context. Paul's aim, as has been stated, is to refute the objection of the Jews, that, if the gospel were true, the Old Testament promises relating to the Jews would remain unfulfilled. And this he refutes, as we have already seen, by saying that "Israel" are not all the descendants of Israel, but those who are "of faith, these are the seed of Abraham." Gal. 3, 6. "He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly. . . but . . . . which is one inwardly", Rom. 2, 28; 8, 29. In brief: those who truly believe are "God's people." And this "His people", which He foreknew, i. e. had in mind from the beginning in all the promises (which, of course, He had also elected) — the promise is "given to them that believe", Gal. 3, 22 — this "people" God hath not now cast away, Paul tells us; God indeed keeps His promise. As an example Paul mentions himself; he too had been a Jew, and yet he enjoyed the grace of God. But no matter what is said regarding "foreknow" — this is clear: "His people" = "believers." Whether the words are taken as we take them: God hath not cast away His believers (also among the Jews) which He foreknew (as such); or whether the words are taken as our opponents take them: Whom He predestinated — there is no difference as far as our present object is concerned; the people God foreknew and also elected are none but believers.

This is corroborated by the example of Elias, whom Paul mentions. The prophet believed that he alone of all the prophets, and indeed of all the godly people of Israel, remained. Paul gives the divine answer briefly in the words: "I have reserved to myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal." These words do not say that God in His secret counsel elected these few unto faith, and therefore

by His absolute power protected them from idolatry; on the contrary, they declare, that these seven thousand were preserved from idolatry through the Word and grace of God, and therefore God also preserved them from punishment. The story is found in 1 Kings 19, 14-18. In verse 14 we have the complaint of Elias against the murderers of the prophets. In v. 15-17 the divine threat, that these murderers shall perish. And then v. 18 declares: "Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal." The point of comparison is this: Elias believed already in his day that all Israel had fallen away; but God knew better, He knew even the exact number and the individual persons, so that He could preserve them from the universal carnage, that these few godly souls should not be slain, as Elias imagined had already been done. "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace," 11, 5. It seems as though the entire nation of the Jews (those who were at that time unconverted) is hardened and cast away. But God knows better; He still has "His people" among them, whom He foreknew and hence also has not cast away; but according to the election of grace — not of works, v. 6. This is the destruction of the rest of the Jews — not indeed gross idolatry of Baal, as in the days of Elias, but their inveterate work-righteousness. Here again no secret rule of election is given, there is nothing but the old rule of the gospel: He who believes — he who does not believe.

Verse 7: "What then?" What is the brief sum of it all? "Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for." What does Israel seek? Faith? No; righteousness. But why does not Israel obtain it? "Because they sought it not by faith," 9. 32. "But the election hath obtained it," i. e. "His people," His elect, "which are of faith," Gal. 3, 7, who "call upon the name of the Lord," Rom. 10, 13.

In the entire discussion there is no trace of a secret election unto faith, hence not a word concerning an unrevealed mystery; there is nothing but the revealed counsel of God in Christ, which, however, was still hidden from the eyes of the work-righteous Jews through their own fault.

When our opponents demand of us that we interpret the dark passages in chapter 9 by themselves and not from the clear passages following, they demand something fundamentally unbib-

lical and un-Lutheran. Hath any man prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith, Rom. 12. The rule for interpretation, which our opponents demand for the protection of their false doctrine of predestination, would be just the thing for chiliasts in their interpretation of Rev. 20. But aside from this, none of the passages in Rom. 9 say in reality what Missouri attempts to make them say. Thus, for instance: "Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth," in no way indicates that a so-called "free" will of election is here meant, as opposed to the universal will of grace. God's will certainly is altogether "free"; He does even "as He wills"; He has "power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor." But let our opponents furnish proof that in election God did not deal according to His revealed will. Our Confession, in the very article concerning election, interprets a number of such passages according to the analogy of faith.

Missouri, in reality, is repeating the role of Israel of old — of course, only in regard to this question. It finds it impossible to "harmonize" God's dealing in regard to the Jews (and in regard to all the non-elect) with the revealed promises. This was exactly what the Jews could not do; the only difference is that Missouri declares, "We believe both" (which, however, is only delusion; for, as we have seen in the case of the notorious proposition above, they understand the universal promises more or less according to the "mystery)." The Jews pretended to abide by the promises given to their fathers (which likewise was a delusion; for they misinterpreted the promises). Missouri will not admit that for time as well as for eternity faith in Christ "makes the difference between those who are saved and those who are damned, between the worthy and the unworthy," as our Confession declares. The Jews refused to admit the same thing — it was this that Paul showed them in Rom. 9 to 11. Missouri believes that God's "free" election made the difference already in eternity, and makes it also in time; for election is said "to execute itself." The Jews believed that their descent from Abraham — and this by reason of "free" election, God simply having selected Abraham and his descendants in preference to other nations — constituted the difference. Missouri, of course, admits that in time faith makes a difference; but neither did Israel deny that they had been chosen unto the true knowl-

edge of God and unto obedience, and that thereby they differed from other people. But in the case of both Missouri and Israel that which poduces the difference is the "free" elective and completely decisive will of God. That "faith makes the difference" can be said according to the doctrine of Missouri only in the same manner as we say in justification that works make the difference, namely, that in them the difference manifests itself, which as such lies deeper and works itself out. In a word, Missouri has a different position for faith in the counsel of God than the Word of God and our Confession.

"When of two baptized children one is elected, and the other is not, the difference works itself out during the entire life, so that the one shall not lack, even though it fall from faith by denying Christ and by perjury, yet it shall and must regain its faith," Report, 1877, 43; Report 1879, 104. And the other child? Well, that of course remains under the universal will of grace! Whoever denies that is a Calvinist, even Missouri declares. But what of this universal will of grace? Oh, God wants to save also this other child, if only it believe in Christ, even Missouri declares. Whence shall it obtain faith? Answer: From the Word and Sacrament (here Missouri does not say: From election!), and since it is baptized it already has faith, and need only persevere, then it will be saved. Can now this child really be saved? (We do not ask, whether it will be saved, for we are speaking of a child which is not elected; our question is, whether the child can be saved, whether Missouri still really believes that God prepared salvation for all, that all really can obtain it.) Is the preservative power for faith found in the gospel as such and as it is preached to all? Answer of Missouri: The grace of perseverance must flow from election; yet election does not include all. If, therefore, I "do not belong to the elect, I may hear God's Word ever so diligently, seek absolution and the Lord's Supper, it is all of no avail — this is certainly so." This is the only answer Missouri can give, in accord with its doctrine of election; the answer which in an unguarded hour, when already it had been privately admonished, yet imagined it could still suppress the opposition, it did give; the answer which, after being given, it denied in Chicago and in "L. u. W."; the answer which it finally again acknowledged and sought to patch up with an orthodox interpretation! And Rom. 11, 13, is to serve as a cover for the whole disgraceful proceeding.

No, the Missourian "mystery" is not such an innocent thing as some who accept it still think, and as its defenders especially endeavor to persuade us. P. Stöckhardt in "L. u. W.", 1881, 368, says plainly, that when he stated in Chicago that he did not know why God had not elected the rest, he "meant nothing but the discretio personarum," i. e. the separation of persons. "Nothing but" this — just as though this did not include everything! This "discretio personarum," this difference between Jews and Greeks, which Paul rejects, Rom. 10, 12, works itself out in time according to Missourian doctrine; this difference goes with us unto Baptism, unto absolution, unto the Lord's Supper; this difference is "as it were clothed and enfolded in the preaching of the gospel." To be sure, he who does not look close will see only the clothing, the outward folds, and will think that we are contending about trifles. But, thank God, we know the masked Calvinistic changeling, and want nothing whatever to do with it; and therefore we declare: —

Election is revealed to us in the Scriptures and is no more a mystery than any other article of faith.

Election in itself is a mystery, and to a certain extent, as stated, the mystery of mysteries, in so far as it includes all the articles of faith and at the same time the "discretio personarum." In so far, however, as all articles, and at the same time the rule according to which God separated sinners from sinners, are revealed, in so far election also is revealed, and essentially no more a mystery than the gospel in general. We deny any mystery said to be separated from the universal gospel by a deep gulf or "abyss," for the Scriptures contain nothing of the kind. The precious gospel, which makes no difference between "Jews and Greeks," inviting all unto Christ with the same earnestness and power, has been given us through the unmerited goodness of God and — we will not forget ungratefully — through Missouri's former faithful work. And we have found such a wealth of consolation and refreshing sweetness in this gospel that we have no hankering whatever for "another" still sweeter consolation in a mere decree of God, separted from the gospel and not to be harmonized with that gospel. Outside of the gospel and "aside" from it is hell; Dr. Luther often warns against it. Our opponents indeed say that the apparent contradiction will be solved in heaven. Well, we are ready to wait as far as other things are concerned, but where the very foundation of our sal-

vation is at stake it is too long for us to wait for heaven; we have need now, even now while we are in the midst of sin and temptation, of the full consolation of the gospel. Besides, it would be tempting God to wait for the solution of a question which the Son of God came into the world to solve by His Word and work. "No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." Therefore St. Paul writes, Rom. 10, 6-8: "But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven" (to search out the will of God), "that is to bring Christ down from above" (who has already come down, and by His Word and work revealed the whole counsel of God to us, sealing it also with signs and miracles, so that, to find mysteries in this will now, would be simply to count the incarnation of God's Son as nothing); "or who shall descend into the deep?" (that is down to the dead, as though the dead knew more concerning this will of God than we now know) "that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead" (to deny that He is risen from the dead and that thereby He brought to light what awaits those who die with Him, namely life and immortality). "But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach." In this Word, therefore, everything is open, light, and clear, and there is nothing for us to expect in the line of further information, as far as our election and salvation is concerned, immediately from God or after death. Paul directs us, not into some mystery, but into the revealed Word; and then at once he continues and declares that God makes no difference between Jews and Greeks, i. e. between men and men, but only between believers and unbelievers.

The source of this faith, according to Paul, is not, as Missouri would have it, the discretio personarum, the selection of some certain persons, but the Word which is "nigh thee": "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Will not Missouri return to the simplicity of Paul, and thus end this lamentable controversy? We cannot accept unrevealed mysteries. To expect the power for persevering in faith from such a mystery, the mysterious part of which consists in the very fact of its hovering only over a few, is truly something altogether unheard of in the Lutheran Church.

If this mystery does not happen to hover also over me, then

I cannot (according to Missourian doctrine) remain in faith, then "everything is of no avail." And if I am not certain that it hovers over me, then all my life long I must be in doubt as to whether I can at all be saved. This is what follows from the doctrine of Missouri concerning election, and therefore Missouri also claims "that a Christian should be and can be certain of his eternal election — unconditionally certain, infallibly certain, just as I can now know from the Scriptures whether I am at present in the grace of God or not." Report, '79, 56. "There (in the Scriptures) I behold God on His seat and the Trinity taking counsel, and I hear my name: This man also shall enter heaven!" (Genuine Calvinistic words!) "This is more certain than if my name were recorded," p. 54. We must give Missouri credit, what it does it does thoroughly. And furthermore: the less proof Missouri has, the bolder and more reckless is the repetition of its bare assertions, the more presumptuous its condemnation of all who dare gainsay; for the sake of this one point Missouri has repeatedly given us to understand that its opponents believe no everlasting life at all! Eternal life is believed in reality only by a Lutheran, i. e. a Missourian!

Our reply shall be that we calmly investigate the matter according to the Word of God.

How do Missourians arrive at the certainty that they, even they, are covered by the mystery? From the Word of God, they tell us. Very well! From the Word of God I can know with certainty that I have been redeemed, because that Word testifies that all are redeemed. From the Word of God I can furthermore know that I am even now in the grace of God; for that Word declares: Ye are all the children of God through faith. And the Holy Ghost seals this knowledge in the hearts of believers, testifying to our spirits that we are the children of God. I am to examine myself, whether I have faith or not, for this is a matter of experience: "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith." 2 Cor. 13, 5. In this examination the written Word furnishes the decisive criteria; for it describes true faith in every respect, showing its foundation, which is Christ's merit, its effects, which are, on the one hand, peace with God in the conscience, and the glad hope of eternal life, on the other hand, heartfelt gratitude toward God, love toward our fellow-men, patience in tribulation, warfare against the flesh, etc. Whether all this is found in myself, even though it be in great weakness, whether

I am therefore in true faith and in this faith have the testimony of the Holy Spirit regarding my adoption, this I can and must "know." And the Scriptures also tell me that God desires to keep me in faith; God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it. No creature is able to separate us from the love of God. No man will take my sheep out of my hand; etc.

These promises are given to all believers, and for this reason every single believer can be certain that they apply also to him. And yet the Scriptures teach very decidedly that all believers are not actually preserved in faith; and Missouri itself declares: "Others, on the other hand, are children of God for perhaps forty or fifty years, and then they allow the devil to blind them, fall away, and are cast into hell." These promises must, therefore, include a condition. If God had promised preservation in faith to believers unconditionally, and if then many were not preserved, God would not be keeping His Word. The condition is also clearly stated in most passages, in others it is only briefly indicated, and hence in the rest it must certainly be supplied. Thus the Lord declares: Neither shall any man pluck my sheep out of my hand; but He adds: My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me. Concerning these words John Brenz writes: "Our Shepherd Christ taught, that we should not sin, and He Himself also never sinned. Hence we are to follow in His steps, that we may never sin. If, however, we have sinned, we must at once repent and return to the Shepherd, so that He may not cease acknowledging us as His sheep; for as far as Christ Himself is concerned He keeps, defends, and protects His sheep with such perseverance, constancy, and faithfulness, that, as St. Paul writes, neither death nor life can move Him to reject and to forsake them." On John 10, 27-28: "Neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand, does not say that they themselves cannot fall away by wilful sins. In Rom. 8 Paul declares that no man can separate us from the love of God; yet in the same chapter, v. 13, he writes: For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die." Luther writes on v. 35: "If we hang to this in true faith, we shall stand just as high, and neither tribulation nor distress nor the devil, neither fire nor water nor any other creature shall overcome us, the victory shall be ours. Only unbelief or the sin of

man himself may separate him from the communion, grace of God, life, and salvation."

Furthermore, when Paul writes, 1 Cor. 10, 13: God is faithful, he has already stated in v. 12: Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall; and he does not say: God makes an end of temptation, so that ye must bear it, but so that ye may be able to bear it. Peter writes in his second Epistle, 3, 17: Beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness. This "steadfastness" is the unimpeachable faithfulness of God and protection of God; no man can pluck us out of this fortress, yet we can fall from it. A Christian, therefore, cannot go beyond this, that he is certain of God's grace at every moment, that thus he is prepared to die at any time, but that in regard to the future he knows only that God will surely keep him, if he does not prevent God from doing so by his own wilful sin. And this is precisely the position of our Confession, as is shown by the seventh decree: "That the good work which God has begun in them He would strengthen, increase, and support to the end, if they observe God's Word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness, and faithfully use the gifts received." Here we have, evidently, an appended condition. God indeed knows in whom the condition will be fulfilled; but do we? Does every Christian know this in advance concerning himself? No! Our certainty concerning future perseverance is and remains conditional. Yet this certainty continues to grow; the more a Christian masters the evil lust in his heart through the grace of God, the greater his fear and detestation of sin, and the stronger his longing for the perfection of eternal life, the more certain will he be of final victory. Therefore our Confession declares, § 73: "And since the Holy Ghost dwells in the elect, who become believing, as in His temple, and is not inactive in them, but impels the children of God to obedience to God's commands; believers, in like manner, should not be inactive, and much less resist the impulse of God's Spirit, but should exercise themselves in all Christian virtue, in all godliness, modesty, temperance, patience, brotherly love, and give all diligence to make their calling and election sure, in order that the more they experience the power and strength of the Spirit within them, they may doubt the less concerning it."

This making sure is certainly the task of our whole life, and

our success is that we "doubt the less concerning it," in other words an increasing certainty. Our opponents reply at this point: If we had a conditional certainty, we would have no certainty at all. Very well! We have already seen that the question before us is twofold: 1) Whether we can be certain that God desires to keep us. To this we reply: Yes, unconditionally certain! 2) Whether we can be certain that we will not prevent God from keeping us by wilful sins. To this we reply: No; what has happened to others may also happen to us, to our opponents also. But if both questions are taken together: Whether we can be certain that we will remain contant; then we reply: Not unconditionally certain. And we appeal to § 70 of our Confession: "Therefore no one who would be saved should trouble or harass himself with thoughts concerning the secret counsel of God, as to whether he also is elected and ordained to eternal life; for with these miserable Satan is accustomed to attack and annoy godly hearts. But they should hear Christ, who is the Book of Life and of God's eternal election of all God's children to eternal life; who testifies to all men without distinction that it is God's will, that all men who labor and are heavy laden with sin should come to Him, in order that He may give them rest and save them."

It is remakable how our opponents seek to evade this sentence. The Report of '79 treats properly concerning the certainty spoken of. And here they have quoted the above passage from the Confession (p. 60 sqq.). The ensuing discussion then begins by saying: "Some deny outright that a Christian can become sure of his election." They proceed by declaring that they have already demonstrated this certainty, feeling, however, that their demonstration is still pretty weak; for while pretending to discuss how a Christian can become sure of his election, they evidently labor for some 30 or 40 pages in attempting to prove that a Christian can be thus certain. But the words above, taken from the Confession, they have indeed in their thesis, but in the discussion they remain altogether untouched. And this very naturally, for the words are clear: "No one who would be saved should trouble or harass himself with thoughts concerning the secret counsel of God, as to whether he also is elected and ordained to eternal life." The last clause states what is meant by the secret counsel of God, concerning which we are not to trouble

or harass ourselves, since it is not revealed in the Scriptures. Instead of thus troubling himself, he "who would be saved" is directed to Christ who calls all men without distinction unto Himself; accordingly he is to repent, believe His promise (which repentance and faith the Holy Ghost desires to work, since we cannot do this of our own powers), implore God for His grace to remain steadfast, which He promised us in holy Baptism (assuredly then to all the baptized?); furthermore, he who would be saved is to be diligent in good works, not to resist the Holy Ghost, etc. And the result will be, that he will doubt the less concerning his final salvation, as we have already heard. This is the line of thought in this entire section of the Confession. In brief: Concern yourselves rather about the universal Gospel, about repentance and faith, prayer and good works. Then, as Dr. Luther well says, "predestination will come of itself." In another place Luther writes: "On these (the means of grace) we are to stand firm, make our boast of them, and say: I am baptized, I believe in Jesus Christ, I have received the Sacrament, etc. What do I care whether I am foreknown or not." Walch 22, 1281. (In fact, this is how Luther constantly expresses himself. All the testimonies, quoted by our opponents from Luther in reference to the certainty of salvation, refer in the first instance to present salvation through faith, concerning which Paul writes, Rom. 8: "We are saved, by hope." This, to be sure, is essentially the same salvation which we shall have in the future; and when a Christian says that he is certain of his salvation, he always means this one identical salvation. But when the explicit question is raised, whether we can lose this salvation or not, then we must hold fast the difference between the certainty regarding the present possession and that regarding the future preservation. And as often as Luther takes up this question, he makes the difference. "All salvation is surely there, but it is uncertain and a subject for care whether he will be constant and retain it." Walch 12, 284. In fact, Luther declares most decidedly that we cannot and should not be certain of our election (in the proper sense of that word; he gives as a reason, that neither repentance nor faith would then be possible! Is it possible that our St. Louis friends found no such passages in Luther's writings? They have always quoted passages in which Luther speaks simply concerning the certainty of election;

as for instance in the Catechism: Where there is forgiveness of sin, there is also life and salvation. At times they have even omitted a few lines, which went to show that Luther was speaking of present salvation and not of perseverance!) But the sense of the paragraph from the Confession is sufficiently clear. According to the views of our opponents this paragraph would have to read: "Therefore, the Christian, who would like to be certain, whether he too is elected and ordained unto eternal life, must look into the Scriptures; there he sees God on his seat and the Trinity taking counsel, and hears his own name: This man too shall enter heaven." This is how the passage would have to read; but this is not the way it does read!

How do the Missourians arrive at this certainty? Let us put one of them on the witness stand and ply him thoroughly with questions! We can take his answers, either word for word, or at least their exact contents from the writings of Missouri. Whence do you know with unconditional and infallible certainty that you are elected?

From the Scriptures; there indeed I do not find the names, but the elect are precisely described. "If one sees that he is there described, he knows with full certainty that he is elected." Rpt. '79, 54.

But there is one point in the description, which reads: perseverance till the end. This point is very essential—do you find this in yourself already?

No; but "I believe firmly and certainly that God will keep me in faith and in sanctification." Page 73.

I believe the same thing; nevertheless many believers do not persevere.

That is true; but there is a certain number concerning which "He has determined, these shall and must be saved"; these therefore must persevere. 1877, 24.

Let us take it for granted that you mean this correctly—which is not the case; for you mean an absolute election. But taken for granted that your meaning is correct—how do you know that you are one of these?

This I must "believe." 1879, 66. He who believes in Christ, loves Christ, uses the means of grace diligently, has in all this clear proof that God has elected him. Page 81.

Are then all believers to believe that they are elected, even those also who believe only for a time?

Yes; for "Paul, who speaks through the Spirit of God, calls the whole congregation of Christians in Ephesus elect, and requires of all of them that they shall believe that they are elected." 66.

Are then all believers elected—are there no temporary believers?

O, there are many; some are faithful for 40 or 50 years and yet they are cast into hell. 1877, 60.

But can temporary believers believe that they belong to the elect, i. e. that they are no temporary believers?

This "we cannot say"—we do not know. 80.

Let us pass the question as to whether they can believe this. But there is another difficulty in the matter. You say, they shall believe this; are they to believe a falsehood?

Yes; he demands of them all that they believe it, "although he knew well that they were not all true Christians, to say nothing of his having been certain that all of them belonged to the elect. 66.

That is indeed terrible! "Paul who speaks through the Spirit of God" "demands of them all that they believe they are elected, although he knew well" that it was not true! Friend, consider your words!

He wants this to be understood synecdochically, i. e. he calls them all elect, because there were some elect among them, as we call a wheat field a wheat field on account of the wheat on it, although there are weeds among the wheat. Paul speaks according to charity, he hopes the best of all. 66 and 70.

Your answer does not remove the difficulty; for, in the first place, it is something altogether different to say: That is a wheat field, although there are some weeds in it; and to demand that the weeds be considered wheat. In the second place, it is strange that you make such an answer now; when Prof. Stellhorn in Chicago said that we men must look upon temporary believers, while they continue to believe, as though they belong to the elect (Minutes, 21), you attacked us for days as though the assertion created the greatest confusion. (Minutes, 42 sqq.) How do you agree with yourselves?

(This question finds no answer in the "publications.")

Furthermore: you say the apostle speaks synecdochically when he requires all to believe that they are elected. Do you perhaps speak synecdochically, when you require all to believe that they are redeemed? Your entire doctrine concerning election points in that direction.

No, no; that is no synecdoche.

A little while ago you said that we did not know whether the non-elect are to believe that they are elected. You therefore consider it impossible?

No.

Nor do I. On the contrary! Since unregenerate man is constantly inclined to error and especially ready to deceive himself as to his own condition, I do not see why he should not consider himself as belonging to the elect, especially when he goes to church and hears the preacher declaring that he must believe himself to be elected. Hypocrites generally imagine themselves to be the best of Christians. The Jews certainly considered themselves the elect. If such now believe that they are elected, they are mistaken, are they not?

To be sure!

And we can understand this mistake so much more easily in the case of temporary believers, as long as they really are "faithful children of God"—perhaps for 40 or 50 years; and besides, if it is preached to them that they must consider themselves elected, it is certainly easy to understand that they will do so.

Of course it is.

Is not in many cases spiritual pride, i. e. boasting of many experiences, of long continued faithfulness, etc., the very cause why such old Christians fall away?

It may well be.

Would it not be far better then to point these people, before they fall, that is from the very beginning to Dr. Luther's words: "Dear brother, permit not yourself to imagine too certainly and securely that you stand; for when you think to stand most firmly, you are perhaps nearest to falling, and it may be that you will fall so as never to be able again to rise." Walch 12, 1068. Would not this be far more necessary than to be pounding the certainty of election into their brains?

We dare not, on account of abuse, be silent concerning pure doctrine nor alter it. Page 34 and in many other places.

It is certainly no abuse of preaching, when hearers believe what you preach to them; and it is certainly not pure doctrine when you demand that those who are not elected are to believe that they are elected.

But one thing more. You admit it to be possible that some of the non-elect believe themselves to be elected, and yet are mistaken. You also believe firmly that your are elected. Now how do you know that you are not one of these who are mistaken?

We close the examination. Whoever examines the questions and answers quietly — without fear of the "Praeses" (President), nota bene! — will see that this last question had to come, and also that the witness could not possibly answer it, and finally that this brings us back to the very question with which we began, namely: Whence do you know with unconditional and infallible certainty that you are elected. He does not know and cannot know it certainly and is not meant to know it certainly, because God has not revealed it. They boast that this certainty of election removes all anxieties concerning their possibly being seduced or their falling away. If that boast were well-founded, their certainty would have to have a surer foundation. They attempt to hold fast to a nail which they must first drive in, they set out to cross a stream in a boat which they must first bring from the opposite bank. In addition they are compelled to swallow so many absurdities, that we must marvel, yea pity them. It is right enough to say that Paul addresses whole congregations as being all among the elect, and that Paul without doubt in charity considered them all as being among the elect. But to say that every single person in the congregation thus addressed is to look upon this address of the apostle as a divine revelation concerning his personal election, is mere fanaticism. Paul exhorts every one to examine himself, whether he is really a Christian. And those who are Christians he warns that they may not become secure and thus fall away. It must therefore be possible for them to fall. But he never exhorts any one to examine himself as to whether he is elected. All this talk about the certainty of election has no shadow of foundation in the Scriptures; it is something altogether unheard of in the Lutheran Church, something unheard of even in the Missouri Synod till just of late. In the Reformed Church it has had its home from away back. It belongs necessarily to the doctrine of absolute election. From election all the treasures of salvation are said to flow. This, therefore, must of necessity be

the great question for myself: Am I elected? — if not, all else is in vain. And yet, however great the certainty of Missouri, they cannot deny that even the elect, after standing for years in faith, may yet fall deeply. Their certainty must therefore include also this, that I know I can again fall into the most abominable sins, nevertheless I must be again converted, as they say explicitly in regard to Peter "and all the elect." An elect person is therefore to know that the most abominable sins cannot hurt him as far as his salvation is concerned. Evidently, this is preaching wickedness, and it is easy to see that careless people will be the first to take such preaching to heart. But in addition, our opponents say that it would be a terrible thought for the Christian, if he had to think: Possibly I may still be lost. On the other hand, however, they are ready to admit this thought: Possibly I may again grieve the Holy Spirit by wilful sins, deny Christ, offend my neighbor, and give the world occasion to blaspheme the name of God; this thought is not so terrible to them. They see not how subtly the devil has deceived them to exalt their love of self above the the fear of God. We, of course, must despair of making such points clear to them, since they cannot or will not understand far simpler things. Nevertheless, we will let our father Luther say a brief word on the subject. He takes up the question: —

"What shall I do, when the devil attacks me with predestination and gives me no rest, saying: I hope in vain and for naught, if I am not predestinated? . . . . Answer: To begin with, hold fast to the fact, that such thoughts are not of God. Therefore we must drive the thought out with all diligence, as one altogether displeasing to God. And that such thoughts are not of God, you are to know by this sign, all that is of God admonishes and moves us to keep God's command and to fulfill His will; for God does and thinks and wants only this, that His will may be done. But this presumptuous anxiety on your part, whether you are predestinated or not, He has so little commanded and required of you that He has even forbidden such anxiety. Ps. 55, 23, where the prophet speaks thus: Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee. And Matt. 6, 31. 33, where Christ declares: Take no thought. Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, etc."

"The devil also attacks you with such useless and harmful anxiety for no other reason, than that you may forget the command of your God, where He has bidden you to hope and to trust

and that he may draw you craftily toward your own desire and unto love of your own self, so that you may begin to seek what is your own. For this is the last and highest of his weapons wherewith to plague us, to care for our own love, so that we may be found guilty against God's command. But what would it help you, if you should be troubled and surrounded by such thoughts till the end of the world? Nothing whatever would be the outcome whereby you might become certain concerning your standing before God, and He also would not care for you."

"Therefore it is necessary, that you set yourself against the work and exertion of unwise people, and that you deliver into the eyes of the devil, who breathes such thoughts into your mind, thunderous blows from the Scriptures, and that you hold them under his nose. First of all this passage, Ps. 1, 2: Blessed is the man that hath delight in the law of the Lord, and in His law doth meditate day and night. Of the law of the Lord, he speaks, not of his own predestination. And this passage of the wise man Sirach, 6, 37: Consider constantly God's commandments, and remember always His Word; He will make thy heart perfect, and will give thee wisdom, which thou desirest. Likewise Moses speaks, Ex. 13, 9, to the people: And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth. And in Matt. 7, 21, Christ declares: Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. And many more such passages."

"God also wants and requires nothing of us but that we keep to His will with constant care. If we do this, predestination will fulfill itself, without our care and seeking. This seducer, however, the devil, desires that first of all you care earnestly for yourself, and finally for God's commands, that thus you prefer yourself to your God, and that you love Him not above all things, yea, that you have no God at all. . . . Therefore you should say: God has not commanded this, but has bidden me to hope; this alone will I obey; the other, even if I would, I cannot do. . . . . For the evil one exerts himself to load you down with this anxiety, that you seek to become certain concerning your predestination, or to see a sign from heaven." Walch 4, 576.

While Missouri vaunts aloud that the elect are unconditionally certain of their salvation, even though they should fall again

into abominable sins — they even shall and must obtain faith again — Dr. Luther writes as follows:

"In Rev. 2, 14, the Holy Ghost rebukes the church at Pergamos for having false teachers and lewdness in its midst, and declares in clear words: Which thing I hate. If now God be angry with any one, that person is not holy, acceptable, etc. And without doubt there were both elect and non-elect among these."

"From these and many other testimonies (1 John 3, 7. 8; Gal. 5, 19; Rom. 8, 13; Ezek. 33, 13; Rev. 2, 14) we have always and with one accord taught in all churches: If a saint knowingly and willingly does contrary to God's command, he is no more saintly, but has cast away true faith and the Holy Ghost. But if he again be converted, God keeps His merciful oath, wherein He declares: As I live, I will not that the sinner die, but that he be converted and remain living. Therefore, God accepts this converted person again for Christ's sake, enkindles true faith in his heart by the gospel and the Holy Ghost; and we are not commanded to search back of this, whether we are elected, for it is enough that we know, that he who perseveres finally in repentance and faith, is certainly elected and saved, as Christ declares: Blessed are they that persevere to the end. This instruction is clear, and is not fruitless for those who have fallen, but teaches them to think highly of God's wrath and to fear, as also it is certainly true that God is truly angry at all sin, whether the elect or the non-elect fall." (According to the doctrine of Missouri the elect lose only faith; but grace, the grace of election, this sum of all grace, whence everything flows, which provides that even the loss of faith work no harm, since it must be rekindled, this grace remains for the elect sinner. And very naturally, this grace was bestowed originally without any regard to faith, hence it cannot possibly be lost. "Whether the elect or the non-elect fall", says Dr. Luther, meaning: It is all the same. But according to Missouri there is all the difference in the world — as great a difference as there is between heaven and hell. Salvation is awarded to the elect without regard to faith; it belongs to him without faith; he is far better off, even when fallen, than the non-elect when they are not yet fallen. But let us hear Luther further!) "Human reason invents an unequal will of God, as though God were a tyrant, having some companions whose doings He permits Himself to be pleased with, whether they be good or not good" (Report, 1879, 38: "Like as a partial father, preferring one child to the other, God deals with

us; only He does not even inquire whether we have obeyed or not, but does as He wills" — "whether it be good or bad"!), "while He hates the rest, whatever they may do. We are not to think thus of the will of God. This saying is eternally true, Ps. 5, 6: Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness or sin. For, although He accepts the saints who still have sin in themselves, He does not accept them without a great ransom; Christ had to become an offering, for the sake of which God accepts and spares us, as long as we remain in faith, and if we are in faith." So far Dr. Luther. Walch 10, 1996 sqq.

According to him, therefore, we are not bidden to go back and inquire, whether we are elected, for it is enough that we know, that whosoever finally perseveres in repentance and faith is certainly elected. For since God's will is not unequal, I know that the same merciful will extends to me as it did to Peter, Paul, and all the elect, and does still; I know that I am to be saved just as well as they, and that I can be; and this is enough for me.

But Missouri invents an unequal will, one to apply to the majority of men: If they believe, God will save them; but alas! He has not resolved to give them faith; this will saves no man. The other: These shall and must be saved; hence God also gives them constant faith. Now since everything depends on this latter unconditional will, it cannot be enough for Missouri to know that whosoever finally perseveres in repentance and faith is certainly elected, but they must go back of this and inquire, whether they are elected, i. e. whether they are included in the mystery. As long as they do not know this they are bound to doubt whether they will at all be saved. For this reason they press the subject of certainty so exceedingly. They destroy the universal gospel for sinners. And therefore they must seek something else for the elect, and we have seen in what miserable shape that leaves them.

Let us now sum up briefly and try to put the windy thing on legs: —

1) The point at issue is the certainty regarding an unrevealed decree of God concerning only individual persons.

2) The Scriptures do not name these persons, nor do they describe them so that they can be distinguished from temporary believers.

3) The Holy Spirit gives no testimony in this regard; the testimony of the Spirit goes no farther than the written Word.

4) To complete the misfortune Missourians add: "Faith

does not give me this certainty" (Chicago Minutes, p. 39)! What then is this certainty? The most disgraceful fanaticism.

Missouri thus darkens the universal will of grace, placing the chief consolation, and at bottom all consolation, into a mysterious will of election; concerning this will, however, it can furnish no certainty for the individual hearer. Therefore we reject their mystery. We know very well that God has reserved many things for His wisdom. But election itself He has revealed to us. Why He did not elect all men, why He elected just these whom He did elect, we know from the Scriptures — Rom. 9 to 11 is the very passage which shows this with the clearness of sunlight; this is precisely the question which is answered in the discussion concerning the rejection of the Jews.

In conclusion we append another testimony from Dr. Luther, rejecting both; in the first place, that Rom. 11, 33, speaks of a mysterious discretio personarum; and secondly, that a Christian is to be and can be unconditionally certain of his election.

"These words of Paul we do not apply to the question concerning divine predestination as regards each person individually, who is to be saved and who is not. For as regards this God would have us inquire and search out nothing whatever. Wherefore also He gives no special revelation in this respect, but directs all men to the Word of the gospel, that they shall hear it, and shall know that, if they believe it, they shall be saved. As all the saints also have comforted themselves with certainty regarding their election and eternal life not by a particular revelation regarding their predestination, but through the faith of Christ. Hence Paul also does not want (in speaking of predestination in three chapters preceding our text) any one to ask or search out, whether he is elected or not, but holds up the gospel and faith to all. As he taught heretofore that we are saved through the faith of Christ, and he writes in Rom. 10, 8. 12. 13: The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart, etc., and interprets himself, saying that this word is to be proclaimed to all men, that they all may believe; as he says: The same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him; for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."

"But he is speaking of God's wonderful government in the church, that those who have the name and fame of being the people of God and the Church (as the people of Israel) are rejected because of their unbelief, while the others, who hitherto

were not God's people and were under unbelief, now that they accept the gospel and believe in Christ, are the true Church before God and are saved; so that it is solely the fault of unbelief that the former are rejected. For the grace of God and mercy in Christ are offered unto eternal life, without any merit, to those who hitherto lay in unbelief and sin, that whosoever will may accept it and believe; as he declares: God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all. Rom. 11, 32."

"Now follows this text, in which, filled with great wonder in view of God's government and work in His church, he begins and exclaims: O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!"

"These are the high thoughts and counsel of God, far transcending all human, yea, all creatures' sense and understanding, that God pours out His goodness so abundantly, and in pure grace and mercy elects the poor, the miserable, the unworthy, those who are concluded under sin, i. e. who truly acknowledge themselves worthy and guilty before God of eternal wrath and condemnation; that they are to know, both what He is, His inner divine essence, and what He has in His heart, namely that He will give through His Son, to those who believe, eternal life and salvation; but the others, who are haughty and boast securely of their great gifts, that they are called of God to be His people in preference to all, having special promises" — (Hold on, Luther! You are surely driving at the Missourians who say: Us, us, the elect, He has called "in preference to all, according to the purpose of election"; to us He has therefore given "special promises," namely that we must persevere, that we must be again converted after grave lapses into sin, that we therefore absolutely cannot be lost. These would certainly be "special promises" — if God had given them to all men, all would be saved. But to us, to us, to us He gave them. They of course do not mean themselves alone, but put them into the mouth of all the elect; but so much the worse for you, Luther! For your words show that you reject the language of all "the elect children of God"; for consider what your words say: "But the others, who are haughty and boast securely of their great gifts, that they are called of God to be His people in preference to all, having special promises, the prophets and the fathers." But this is the outcome of your

"denying the mystery," having no better knowledge than this, that God "holds up the gospel and faith to every one," imagining that everything is revealed, attempting to harmonize everything with reason, denying also "that any one should inquire or search out whether he is predestinated or not," imagining that it is enough for us to know that whoever perseveres in repentance and faith is certainly elected and saved. Moreover, you speak in a gross Pelagian way, that God's grace and mercy in Christ is offered to all unto eternal life that whosoever will may accept it and believe; yea, in other places you speak out grossly concerning man's "conduct," and you say here that God has elected the poor, i. e., according to your own explanation, those "who consider themselves worthy and guilty of condemnation," that is those who repent, and you keep on saying because we believe, for the sake of faith, on account of faith God is gracious. And if you would say all this only in reference to the revealed counsel, it might be allowed to pass; but unfortunately you say this also in reference to eternal election! Or do you intend to deny it, Luther? Look, here are your own words — found in your epistolary sermon for the 5th Sunday after Epiphany — "They, however, (the work-righteous) are holy in their own eyes; hence they always remain godless and sinners before God. So also we are loved of God because we hate, judge, and condemn ourselves and let our own love go; but they are dear and precious to themselves, therefore they are hated and unacceptable before God. Again, we are elected before God, because we reject and despise ourselves as filth. For such He elects and has elected from eternity. But because they elect themselves,"— are you driving at Missouri again, Luther? — "they must be rejected of God, as He has rejected even such from eternity." Luther, Luther! Missourians have had enough patience with you. We would like to keep on covering up your "naevi," your failings, with the mantle of charity! But these miserable opponents of Missouri appear to have kept you back till the last as their best champion; they say that they find a great deal of this kind in your writings. If this is true, and if they bring all this forward, then, for the sake of the mystery, Missouri must turn also against you. They must remain true to their call; God intends to reform His church through them; and as you yourself in your own Reformation did not heed the cry of the papists: "Fathers, fathers!" you will hardly dare complain, when

Missouri, of course only in the extreme hour of need, numbers you among the "fathers." You can be thankful for this to us. Nevertheless we will proceed to hear you out on Rom. 11, 33.)

"The others, however, who are haughty and boast securely of their great gifts, that God has called them to be His people in preference to all, having special promises, prophets, and fathers, etc.; who imagine that God can and will acknowledge no other people on earth than themselves as His people and church — these He rejects and condemns because of their unbelief, wherein haughtiness and a fond conceit of their own wisdom and sanctity keeps them."

"That is certainly a rich, unspeakable, divine wisdom and knowledge, which those alone have who believe in Christ, that they can look into the great depth and behold what is the mind and meaning of the divine heart" (here Luther again refers to the revealed "mind" of God, while St. Louis clearly refers it to an unrevealed mind); "although in their weakness they cannot reach it perfectly, nor comprehend it further than they are able to comprehend in faith of the revealed Word, as in a mirror and picture (as St. Paul says, 1 Cor. 13, 2), while to blind unbelieving reason everything remains foreign and hidden, and nothing whatever enters into their minds and thoughts; in fact, this reason does not want to hear or know even when these things are revealed unto it."

"St. Paul saw and experienced, how especially the proud Jewish people opposed obdurately and with stiffneckedness this preaching of the gospel, so that he himself marveled and said: What shall I say? I see indeed that this is nothing but the deep, unfathomable wisdom of God, and His judgments past finding out and His unsearchable ways. As also He says in another place: But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory, which none of the princes of this world knew. 1 Cor. 2, 7. 8." So far Dr. Luther. W. 12, 839.

This interpretation of Rom. 11, 33, on the part of Luther conflicts in no way with what our Confession says in reference to the passage, namely that we cannot know God's judgments without and aside from the revelations of God's Word. The simple sense of the passage is undoubtedly the one Luther has found therein. From this follows neccessarily what our Confession has taken from the passage, namely that our knowledge

does not go beyond God's revelation. Whatever lies beyond we Christians cannot know. And the Confession proceeds at once to enumerate what these unrevealed things are; namely 1) "who of those who are called will believe or will not believe; also who of the converted will persevere and who will not; who after a fall will return, and who will fall into obduracy. So, too, the number, how many there are of these on both sides, is beyond all doubt known to God." 2) The time and the hour of the call and conversion, which God has fixed for each. 3) The judgments of God concerning individual persons and nations.

But that God should have hidden the very chief thing from us, namely why He has elected only a few to salvation, that the cause of this lies in a secret will of God, that at least He did not act according to the revealed rule in this matter: He that believes shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned — putting the whole Word of God into doubt — that this properly constitutes the mystery of election, and that Paul speaks of this in Rom. 11; concerning all this our Confession says not a single word. On the contrary it sets up as the rule of election: That God "in His eternal divine counsel determined to save no one except those who acknowledge His Son Christ and truly believe on Him."

Dr. Walther (Chicago Min., p. 47) simply says on this: "I do not acknowledge it, when they take this as the rule of election." But what, then, does the Confession mean with this sentence? Where does this decree belong? Before election? Then evidently it would be the rule. This is what Missouri will not have. After election then? Then the whole would mean: God, to begin with, chose a certain number, to whom He determined to give grace, that they should acknowledge His Son Christ and truly believe on Him, and no one but these will He now save. Then the rest would not only not be elected, but would also be excluded from salvation by a definite decree. And we have always understood the doctrine of Missouri in this way. But they claim that this is not their meaning; in the election of the elect, they say, nothing has been determined concerning the rest; these would still remain under the "universal counsel of grace." This is very evidently a useless evasion. In the election of the elect it was at least determined concerning the rest that they are not elected, that the fountain whence everything must "flow" does not flow for them. Our opponents deal

altogether with fallacious deductions. If a man determines to rescue twenty out of a hundred wrecked passengers, we can of course say, the rescue of these twenty is not the cause of the destruction of the rest; but every reasonable man will see that the selection of those who are to be saved settles the fate of the rest. Thus our opponents say that the election of God is not the cause of the destruction of the rest. Of course not! But their eternal fate is thereby sealed. For without election no persevering faith, is the teaching of Missouri; without persevering faith no salvation, is the teaching of Scripture. As soon, therefore, as God chose the persons whom He intended to save, that soon the adverse judgment was passed regarding the rest. It is indeed perfectly correct, if it be admitted, that God looked for faith in election; for then only those are not elected, but rejected, who in spite of all God's grace do not believe. But our opponents place election prior to the regard of faith; they teach an election unto faith, and then, to cover up this Calvinism, they pretend that this election decides nothing concerning the rest. But our Confession blocks this evasion, it puts in place of it a definite eternal decree of God: That He determined to save no one except those who believe on Christ (but according to Missouri these would be the ones already numbered and set aside by the election unto faith). The meaning would therefore be: These I have elected unto faith; they now shall and must believe, and besides these I will save no one. In how far then would the rest still be under the universal counsel of grace?

But the clear words of the Confession establish beyond a doubt that this decree of God gives the rule according to which God separated the persons. This is made more certain still by the preceding paragraph, which gives the cause why only so few are chosen — our Confession solves the mystery: —

"That, however, many are called, few are chosen, does not mean that God is unwilling that all should be saved, but the reason is that they either do not all hear God's Word, but wilfully despise it, close their ears and harden their hearts, and in this manner foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in them, or, when it is heard, they consider it of no account, and do not heed it. For this not God or His election, but their wickedness, is responsible." These are the words of our Confession! Where is the mystery in them?

The Holy Ghost cannot effect His work in them, i. e. cannot give them faith or keep them in faith, because they foreclose the ordinary way to Him, harden their hearts by wilfully despising the Word; and this is the reason, why God did not elect them; for "He determined to save no one except those who truly believe on Christ."

This word especially, that God can not effect His work in them, is treated with special hostility by our opponents. Whereas Dr. W. himself, in earlier and better days, often used similar strong language (compare his Postille, p. 53, column 2: "One cause," etc.; p. 91, c. 2: "God Himself cannot help him," etc.; p. 92, c. 2: "On the contrary, that for this very reason God could not elect many"; p. 93, c. 2: "because He foresaw that they would not believe and be converted"; p. 325, c. 2: "What now can, what shall, what must God do with such people?"); whereas, therefore, he had hitherto spoken precisely like our Confession, he now reviles us most bitterly, when we use the same words. Thus he writes in the "Illumination," p. 40: "The fact, that God does not give the gift of faith to all men, is due, according to Prof. Stellhorn's reason, simply to this, that God could not give it to all." Page 39: "On pages 12 and 13 Prof. Stellhorn takes the great and majestic God to task in a way that simply raises the hair of a god-fearing reader. Like an arch-rationalist he determines precisely what God could have done, and what He could not have done." And we must not forget that Prof. Stellhorn nowhere states absolutely that God could not convert and save all, but that He could not do this within the order which God had Himself established, etc.; as though I were to say, God has established the order not to save any one except he believe in Christ, and not to convert any one except he do not despise His Word wilfully. For this reason God now cannot (if He would abide by His order) convert those who despise nor save those who remain unbelievers. Prof. Stellhorn fixed no bounds for God's ability, remaining himself within the bounds fixed and revealed by God. Whether God could not, if He would depart from His order, convert and save all — he did not say, and the Confession does not say, but speaks only of the regular way which they foreclose to the Holy Ghost. But Dr. W. himself had absolutely denied in his Postille that God could convert those who resist wilfully; for on p. 91 he writes: "God does not want to force any one unto repentance; a forced conversion

is no conversion"; and what he means by this is shown on p. 325: "Shall He tie the hands and feet of those who resist, drag them to the heavenly table of His grace, and force them with violence to see and to taste His goodness? Shall God Himself rend to pieces the law of His holiness, which He has given to all rational creatures, and cast it under the feet of man to be forever trampled upon and disgraced? Shall God cease to be righteous, and thus cease to be God, that man may remain in sin and yet be able to be saved? Yea, shall God make Himself an object of the everlasting scorn and mockery of men, that men may eternally make sport of His weakness? "

This evidently means to say that God absolutely cannot convert those who obdurately resist; they would remain unconverted even in heaven and make sport of Him. And God Himself would have to destroy the law of His holiness, would have to cease being God, if He would take these into heaven. But that is absolutely impossible, hence it is also absolutely impossible for Him to elect them.

But this is saying in the strongest possible way that God found no such resistance in the elect, and thus all Calvinism is completely shut out. Having such strong declarations, we felt compelled to explain the utterances on pp. 93 and 94 in an orthodox way, namely that repentance and faith flow from election. They could be understood as meaning that God foresaw which He would be able to convert, and these then He elected unto conversion and salvation; not because He saw something good in them, but because He greatly desired to save all of His grace for Christ's sake; wherefore He elected all thereunto whom He could save, without "rending to pieces the law of His holiness."

Page 94 shows that this is what is really meant: "You, now, who remain in your sins and will not turn yourselves heartily to Christ, dare not imagine that you can excuse yourselves by saying that God would not grant you the grace of conversion and salvation. No; God greatly desires to save you, if only you would permit yourselves to be saved. Christ declares: Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. This word applies also to you. Only recognize your misery and go to Christ, and He will in no wise cast you out, and then you can confess with joy and gladness: God has chosen me also from eternity unto

salvation. But if you will not do this—then do not accuse God, but call down woe upon yourselves, for then Christ declares concerning you: How often would I have gathered you together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. For those whom God has chosen, He has chosen not merely unto salvation, but also unto repentance and sanctification, as St. Paul sets before us the indestructible golden chain of salvation: Whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son; moreover, whom He did predestinate them He also called; and whom He called them He also justified; and whom He justified them He also glorified. Whoever, therefore, will not permit himself to be conformed to the image of God's Son need not be surprised to find that the other links in the chain of salvation and the election of grace do not pertain to him.

Briefly then: "When you will permit yourselves to be saved"—then you can . . . confess: "God has chosen me also from eternity unto salvation." "But if you will not do this," then call down woe upon yourselves. "FOR" — now the reason is furnished—"those whom God has chosen, He has chosen not merely unto salvation, but also unto repentance and sanctification." Whomever, therefore, He could not elect unto repentance and sanctification, He could also not elect unto salvation. "Whoever, therefore, will not permit himself to be conformed to the image of God's Son need not be surprised"—there is no "wonderful mystery" about it—"to find that the other links in the chain of salvation and the election of grace do not pertain to him"!

Preceding this he says: "The cause, why they believe constantly is that they are elected," and quotes in proof § 8 of the F. C. We see from this that then already he did not properly understand the words: Election is a cause which procures, helps, and promotes our salvation and what pertains thereto. But it is clear that he put an altogether orthodox construction on the sentence he misunderstood. For an "election unto faith", understood as he here explains it, contains nothing Calvinistic. The root of the present error lies indeed in the misunderstanding of this sentence of the Confession, and our opponents point triumphantly to these utterances of Dr. Walther to prove that at that time already he publicly taught as he does now. But they say nothing of his explanations, which remove completely any Cal-

vinistic construction. And Dr. W. himself reviles Prof. Stellhorn, as we have seen, for writing: God cannot, etc., while he himself, Dr. W., had gone much, much farther in this regard. He declared it to be absolutely impossible for God to convert and save those who obstinately resist, whereas Prof. Stellhorn spoke only of conversion and salvation in the "ordinary way", precisely as does our Confession. If now St. is an "arch-rationalist" on this account, what then was Dr. W.? And if St. is now an "arch-rationalist", and if Dr. W. has been the same or worse how then about the Confession, which also declares: The Holy Ghost cannot effect His work in them? How does Dr. W. agree with the Formula of Concord now? For this is the climax of the entire present controversy: Did God, in eternal election, find in those whom he did not elect such a hindrance that He could not elect them, and do we know what this hindrance is; or is it an unrevealed mystery, why God did not ordain all unto salvation, and why just those, not the rest? Could God, as Missouri has explicitly asserted, remove the resistance of the non-elect "just as easily" as that of the others, so that it is a mystery why He does not do so? Missouri says that God could, our Confession that He could not; Missouri claims that in this there lies an unsearchable mystery, our Confession explains the matter and furnishes a "cause"; Missouri thus makes election itself altogether a mystery, our Confession tells us to seek election in the Word where also it is revealed. Missouri declares that we cannot explain election, that we cannot harmonize it with the universal counsel of grace, that between the two there lies a deep gulf which we cannot span; our Confession declares that election is "explained" by the parable in Matt. 22 (concerning the king's marriage feast) and in other places. How then does Missouri agree with the Confession? Answer: Just as it agrees with Dr. Luther, with Chemnitz (see Minutes, 81!), with Gerhard, etc., and with Dr. W.'s own Postille! Missouri now agrees with the Confession just as it does with Dietrich's School Catechism, concerning which they said at Ft. Wayne: "As far now, in particular, as Dietrich's small Catechism is concerned, which our synod has adopted as its own, it must be said that the passage treating of election unto eternal life is one that can be understood entirely aright. The synod is not bound to interpret Dietrich's small Catechism, which it has made its own, according to incorrect

utterances which the original author made in other writings; on the contrary, it understands the Catechism according to the utterances of the author which are perfectly in accord with the Confession, and according to the Confession of the Church, which interpretation the words of the Catechism admit." Report 1881, 83.

They thus dare no longer assert that the Catechism contains their doctrine; they only say that the Catechism can be understood entirely aright, that the words admit the correct, i. e. Missourian interpretation, which means that they can so twist the words; and their authority for so doing is the fact, that the synod has adopted the Catechism "as its text-book", they are therefore not bound, i. e. in duty, to interpret it according to incorrect utterances made by the original author, i. e. old Dietrich himself, in other writings.

It is absolutely not true—any person can convince himself about it—that the words of the Catechism "admit the interpretation" of Missouri, i. e. that an election unto the call and unto faith can be found in them. To admit this interpretation the words must be miserably perverted. And if they claim authority for this because they have adopted the Catechism as their "text-book", we proceed to inquire: Why do they take a Catechism as a text-book which does not clearly and definitely contain their doctrine? And then: If they claim authority to give the Catechism an interpretation different from the original signification of the words, would they not have had authority simply to alter the section concerning election, to supplement, or to explain it, especially since they have actually added other questions, as the preface clearly declares?

The simple case is this: Missouri has latterly changed its doctrine of election and does not like to admit it. We will see later how they themselves interpreted Dietrich. Missouri happens to be in a difficulty, hence it lies a little—to be sure, a little strongly. It stands in contradiction to Rom. 8, 11, to the F.C., to Dr. Luther, to Chemnitz, to all our dogmaticians, to its own Catechism, and to its own former self, and lacks the courage to abandon all and take its position beside the Calvinists alone. Hence it contents itself to "interpret" all contradictory propositions, i. e. to give them another meaning. Only in us Missouri condemns the sentences which on the part of the Confession and of our old teachers it finds merely liable to misunderstanding, so

that they can still be interpreted correctly. It condemns these sentences in us, because we are still alive, and will not be silent and submit to its perversions. For this reason they send the Presidents to harass us, declare us "unworthy of the office", as people who have broken their ordination vows, seek to expel us, and, when this fails, erect opposition altars in our congregations! The old Crypto-Calvinists once proceeded in exactly the same way and were successful for a long time, till at last the bubble of deception burst.

THESIS III.

Election is revealed in the gospel and not in the law.

The foregoing discussion has shown us in general that election is revealed in the Scriptures, and is therefore no mystery, as Missouri would have it. The Scriptures, however, contain a twofold revelation, the law and the gospel. The present thesis tells us where we must seek election; it is revealed in the gospel and not in the law.

The law reveals our sin and the wrath of God because of sin. It shows us no escape from this wrath and gives no hope whatever. Hence there can be no thought of election unto eternal life in the law.

Since election is revealed in the Scriptures, it must be revealed in the gospel; for there is no third revelation in regard to the salvation or condemnation of men. In John 1, 17, we are told: "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." In Gal. 3, 2, Paul asks: "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" A third means, whereby they might think to have received the Spirit, is therefore inconceivable. Accordingly, there are not three revelations, the law, the gospel, and the doctrine of predestination; on the contrary, election is revealed in the gospel. If, therefore, the gospel is preached entirely and fully, it will necessarily include election, even though the word "election" is not named. For everything depends not on a single word, but on the matter itself. The law and the gospel can be preached, and both of them perfectly correctly, without naming either of the two words. Accordingly our Confession declares: "Christ . . . has published to us the will of the Father, and thus also our eternal election to eternal life, viz. when He says: Repent ye, and believe the gospel; the kingdom of God is at hand. He also says: This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have everlasting life. And again: God so loved the world, etc." Art. XI., § 67.

Election is named in none of these passages; and yet our Confession declares that election is revealed in them; they con-

tain the thing itself and not the name. The preaching of the Gospel, therefore, is at the same time the preaching of predestination. This is really self-evident, if only we hold fast that election is revealed in the Gospel, as the F. C. constantly reiterates.

But our opponents twist all these declarations of the Confession about (we will examine them presently) by saying that "revealed in the Gospel" is only to state that the elect come to know from the Gospel that they are elected. They tell us that the Gospel does not reveal election itself, the rule or the order according to which God elected one man and did not elect another; that this is an unsearchable mystery; but that we must learn from the Gospel whether I or whether you are elected. But we have already seen that this is the very thing they cannot learn with unconditional certainty from the Gospel; for, since they themselves admit that some "faithful Christians" may deny their faith even after 40 or 50 years and be lost, and since the Gospel gives them no "special promises" which would not be given to other "faithful Christians," therefore they cannot derive from the Gospel the certainty, that it will never be possible for them to deny the faith and be lost. The words, "election is revealed in the Gospel," cannot possibly say this. And they do not say it. But our opponents are compelled by their doctrine to evade the clear sense of the words and to take refuge constantly in artificial interpretations. For, as we have already seen, they claim that there are two altogether dissimilar counsels; one, that before the foundation of the world God elected a number of men to salvation, the other, that which He revealed in the Gospel. They tell us that these two counsels apparently contradict each other. But we have already seen that, as they state them, there is a real contradiction. According to the revealed counsel God desires the salvation of all men with the same earnestness and there is no respect of persons, i. e. none is preferred, and none is neglected: outside of Christ God sees them all as the children of wrath, unto Christ He would lead them all, yet none with irresistible power, in Christ all are to be accepted. But according to the Missourian counsel of election God would have made provision only for a few, would have granted the grace of election—which in reality comprehends all grace—from the very start only to a few, without seeing any cause for such action on His part in men, either on the one side or on the other. This is an unsolvable mystery. But

furthermore, according to the counsel revealed in the Gospel God offers forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation to all men, only however on the condition of their believing in Christ, which faith He is ready to kindle in the heart by this offer of His. But according to the Missourian counsel of election God would have bestowed forgiveness of sin, life, and salvation and faith in the bargain upon some certain persons without a condition. The one counsel of God would therefore be universal, yet conditional, the other particular and unconditional. The latter, therefore, cannot possibly be contained in the former, or, which is the same thing, election could not possibly be revealed in the Gospel, for then the Gospel would have to contradict itself. But our opponents hold with the same tenacity to the assertion that election is a mystery; they warn us, never to confound the two—universal counsel of grace and predestination—but to keep them carefully separated, as we separate Law and Gospel. "L. u. W." writes: "Only in so far as the elect hear the Gospel, believe in Christ, etc., does the preaching of the Gospel enter the idea of predestination." In every other respect then the Gospel has nothing to do with the idea of "election"! The two touch, as it were, only at one point. We ask every sensible Christian whether this can be what our Confession declares: "Election is revealed in the Gospel"? They say: "It pleased God to clothe and enfold, as it were, the mystery of our election in the preaching of the Gospel." Note it: "As it were"—not even in reality—"to clothe and enfold." And this is to mean: "Election is REVEALED to us in the Gospel"!! So shamefully they find themselves compelled to twist and turn the lucid, clear words of the Confession in order to hold fast their false notion, that God did not act according to the revealed rule in election: He that believes shall be saved.

Just as they say, the preaching of the Gospel enters the idea of predestination "only in so far" as the elect hear the Gospel, so we could say, with the same right, the preaching of the law enters the idea of election; for the elect also hear the law. Do they not? And then election would be revealed also in the law—in the same manner as in the Gospel!

But let us examine what our Confession means by saying: "Election is revealed in the Gospel."

The F. C. is divided into two parts. The first states each

separate article briefly and tersely; this is the Epitome. The second proves and explains each article fully; this is the Solid Declaration. Each of these two parts has its special merits. The Epitome makes it easy to see at once the chief points at issue in each article. The Solid Declaration then proceeds to discuss these points from all sides and to put them into the proper light.

We begin by taking up the Epitome of the eleventh article. First of all the "pure and true doctrine concerning this article" is stated in 14 theses, and then the "false doctrine concerning this article" in 4 theses.

The first four theses read as follows:

1) "First of all, the distinction between foreknowledge and predestination ought to be accurately observed."

2) "For the foreknowledge of God is nothing else than that God knows all things before they happen, as it is written: There is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets and maketh known to the King Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Dan. 2, 28."

3) "This foreknowledge is occupied alike with the godly and the wicked; but it is not the cause of evil or of sin, so that men do what is wrong (which originally arises from the devil, and the wicked, perverse will of man); nor the cause of their ruin, for which they themselves are responsible; but only regulates it, and fixes to it a limit how long it should last, and that everything, notwithstanding that in itself it is evil, should serve His elect for their salvation."

4) "The predestination or eternal election of God, however, is occupied only with the godly, beloved children of God, and this is a cause of their salvation, which He also provides as well as disposes what belongs thereto. Upon this our salvation is founded so firmly that the gates of hell cannot overcome it."

This portion of the article we must examine a little more closely. We have here the difference between God's foreknowledge and God's predestination or eternal election. The difference is twofold: —

1. The foreknowledge of God is occupied alike with the godly and the wicked, hence with all men. Thesis 3. — Predestination or election, however, is occupied only with the godly.

2. The foreknowledge of God is "nothing elese than that

God knows all things", even what is evil, and it is no cause of the evil. — Predestination, however, is a cause of salvation.

This difference "ought to be accurately observed", we are told. And why so? So as to ward off the impious notion, that God is guilty of the sin and ruin of the wicked, which is explicitly denied in thesis 3. It cannot and dare not be denied that God foreknows the evil; He Himself has foretold much evil in the Scriptures, e. g. Judas' betrayal, the wickedness of antichrist, the great falling away in the last times, etc. But this foreknowledge is no cause of sin, it is "nothing else" than that God sees and knows it in advance. God knew well and even foretold that Judas would betray. But this did not compel Judas to betray; on the contrary, because he betrayed of his own wickedness and through the devil's impulse, therefore God foreknew the betrayal. God's foreknowledge, therefore, was no predestination, no ordaining thereto. The earlier Calvinists denied this distinction; they asserted that God foreknew all things simply because He Himself had foreordained them, even sin. They taught that predestination is occupied with all men, viz. some were ordained unto unbelief and unto damnation, others unto faith and unto salvation; they taught an election of wrath and an election of grace.

This double idea of election and predestination our Confession wants to abolish; and this is the intention above all of thesis 4: "The predestination or eternal election of God, however, is occupied only with the godly, beloved children of God", "who were elected and appointed to eternal life before the foundation of the world", as the Solid Decl. adds, in order to show beyond peradventure that this is a predestination unto life and not unto death.

Concerning this predestination thesis 4 goes on to say: "And this is a cause of their salvation, which He also provides as well as disposes what belongs thereto, etc." These words, as far as the F. C. and its interpretation is concerned, constitute the chief point of controversy between us and our opponents, and, beginning with these words, we differ with them on every following sentence to the end of the article. They lose the real purpose of these first four propositions of the Confession. Whereas nothing but the "difference" is to be stated here, in order to ward off the false notion of a double predestination unto salvation and unto condemnation, and in order thus to pave the way for the treatment proper of the doctrine of predestination, they tear these four theses

from their context and claim: "Predestination is occupied only with the children of God" — this already is all the Confession means to say regarding election itself; nor do the Scriptures reveal more than this, that God merely has elected a few. Why so; according to what rule and order; why not also the rest? — this is all a mystery. And then they interpret the words: "Predestination is occupied only with the godly, beloved children of God", or as the Sol. Decl. has it: "Predestination pertains not at the same time to the godly and the wicked, but only to the children of God" — they interpret these words as though God had viewed all men as godless, and had then chosen some of them in order to make of them pious, beloved children of God. Hence they frequently use "persons" or "men" instead of "children of God." The following words: "Predestination is a cause of their salvation", they take to prove that God has prepared something special for these elect persons, in a word, that He elected them unto the call and unto faith.

Everything that follows in the Confession, Missouri thinks, is merely to show how a Christian becomes certain of his election.

But we need only to read the article in its connection in order to see at once that thesis 4 treats still of the difference discussed, and says concerning election itself only what is necessary to elucidate this difference. The proper elucidation of the doctrine of election itself begins with thesis 5, which reads: —

5) "This is not to be investigated in the secret counsel of God, but to be sought in the Word of God, where it is also revealed."

"It", election, "is revealed in the Word." Can this mean to say that from the Word of God we can become certain of our election? If the F. C. really desired to say that, it would use words entirely different.

6) "But the Word of God leads us to Christ, who is the Book of Life, in whom all are written and elected that are to be saved, as it is written: He hath chosen us in Him (Christ) before the foundation of the world."

In the Word, therefore, yet not in the law, but in the gospel (the Word leads us to Christ) we are to seek election; for Christ is the Book of Life. In Him we are chosen. The Sol. Decl., §65, is similar: "Therefore this eternal election of God is to be considered in Christ, and not beyond or without Christ." To "consider" election, evidently, is not to search out whether I am elected, but

to meditate upon election itself, what it is, and what about it. This, however, is not learned by speculations concerning the secret counsel of God, but by the gospel of Christ. And what do we hear about election in this gospel?

7) "Thus Christ calls to Himself all sinners, and promises them rest, and He is anxious that all men should come to Him and permit Him to help them. To them He offers Himself in His Word, and wishes them to hear it, and not to stop their ears or despise the Word. He promises besides the power and efficiency of the Holy Ghost, and divine assistance for perseverance and eternal salvation."

This is what we learn of Christ concerning eternal election, namely that He calls all sinners unto Himself and promises them rest. And since the Calvinists taught, Christ calls all sinners indeed, but He really means only the elect, the Confession at once adds: "And He is anxious that all men should come to Him and permit Him to help them; to them He offers Himself in the Word." But these words are as necessary now against Missouri as they are against the old Calvinists. Missouri in part at least avoids the old, notorious expressions, yet it holds the same doctrine. They do not say that Christ is not anxious and in earnest in calling all men. But they do say: He calls only the elect "according to the purpose"; whether the difference is great, or whether there is any difference at all, is easy enough to see. Likewise they teach as do the Calvinists, that no man obtains persevering faith who is not called according to that particular purpose.

This is one thing Christ tells us concerning election, namely that from the start and according to the intention of God nobody is excluded from salvation and therefore also not from predestination. The doctrine of universal grace, of the redemption of all men, of the earnest and efficacious call of all men, in brief, the doctrine of the universal counsel of grace is the foremost and most important thing in considering predestination. For thus alone does it become clear that God's grace is really universal, and that it is not God's fault that so many men are lost. As has been said, all this belongs necessarily to the idea of election; and our opponents themselves brand their doctrine as false and godless by their very claim, that in the doctrine of predestination there must be silence as regards universal grace, that they cannot harmonize the two.

But thesis 7 continues: "He wishes them to hear it, and not

to stop their ears or despise the Word." Something of this sort, therefore, is possible, and alas, it actually takes place, and that often; and thesis 11 lays special stress on this as being the cause why so few of the called are chosen. Thesis 7 goes on to say: "He promises besides the power and efficiency of the Holy Ghost, and divine assistance for perseverance and eternal salvation."

These are golden words, and like an iron wall they oppose all the tricks and arts of interpretation which Missouri brings against them.

Christ "promises" — and what He promises He will most surely give. What does He promise? The power and efficiency of the Holy Ghost (for conversion through the Word, which all men are to hear), divine assistance for perseverance and eternal salvation. So then, He promises everything that the elect really obtain. To whom does He promise all this? Only to the elect? By no means! "Besides", i. e. for the hearing of the Word, no matter who hears it. The Missourian Calvinistic fable, that God has determined to send the Holy Ghost especially to the elect, so that they must be converted, must persevere in faith, has no shadow of foundation in the Confession. The Confession never speaks of an election unto the call, unto faith; on the contrary, it testifies here and everywhere that Christ calls all sinners unto Himself, and that all men are to come to Him.

Admission to the treasures of salvation is, therefore, open to all men; but men are bound to the right use of the Word. Whoever wilfully despises it will not be saved by God, and is not elected of God. Thus election is revealed in the gospel, and just so much and no more is stated in the Confession.

Thesis 9 especially shows clearly that we have given the true sense of the F. C. Thesis 8 gives the contrary position, and thesis 9 then proceeds to repeat the foregoing briefly. Let us take this up at once: —

9) "But the true judgment concerning predestination must be learned alone from the Holy Gospel concerning Christ, in which it is clearly testified that God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all, and that He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance and believe in Christ."

"It must be learned alone from the Holy Gospel" — what must? The true judgment concerning predestination, according to what rule and order God separated men. This interpretation

our opponents cannot admit, as long as they do not intend to give up their entire doctrine of predestination; for if we can learn from the gospel the rule according to which God elected and rejected, if this rule is revealed in the Gospel, then Missouri errs in asserting that God elected according to a hidden rule, according to a so-called "free" will, then it errs in asserting that we do not know "why God did not elect the rest", then it errs in denying that God considered faith in election, then it errs in asserting an election unto the call and unto faith and thereby evidently a twofold call through the gospel, hence evidently also a twofold Baptism — one according to the purpose of election, the other without such a purpose. In all these specifically Missourian-Calvinistic inventions Missouri errs, if the rule of election is revealed in the gospel. Hence Missouri declares obstinately, as already stated, that all these sentences in the Confession: "Election is revealed in the gospel"; "It must be learned from the Holy Gospel", etc., mean only to say that in the gospel a Christian is to seek the certainty of his election — in the gospel, not immediately in the secret counsel of God. All who have really comprehended accurately the point on which the whole controversy turns, will readily admit that we are right and our opponents wrong, if the rule of election is revealed in the gospel; and that we agree with the Confession, while our opponents have fallen from it, if the expressions referred to in the Confession state not the personal certainty of individual Christians concerning their own election, but the simple rule of election. It will therefore certainly be worth the trouble to study carefully these expressions of the Confession.

Now there is a large number of such phrases in the Confession, and when we carefully collate them, there can remain no doubt whatever as to their true meaning, even though one or the other of them, taken by itself, might be twisted in a double sense.

Thesis 5 reads: "This — election — is not to be investigated in the secret counsel of God." In the same way: It is "to be sought in the Word of God." "This", "Election" — can that signify, "The certainty of my election"? Furthermore: "Where it is also revealed." Can our opponents themselves declare that it is revealed in the Word that they are elected? They can only say that the marks of the elect are given in the Word, and from these marks they can draw certain conclusions. But the Word evidently does not reveal in whom these marks are found. If it were revealed in the Word that for instance they, our opponents,

are elected, then, besides their being certain themselves of their election, other people also would have to be able to find in the Word that they, our opponents, or whoever else is elected, are elected. "Election is revealed in the gospel" — cannot possibly express what they would have it express. Our opponents themselves do not use such language when they speak of their certainty but employ altogether different words; and when they come to these sentences in the Confession they are compelled to use the boldest kind of interpretations to arrive at the meaning they desire. This, election is revealed in the gospel, is to say: I become certain from the Word that I am elected! Even if the latter proposition were true, other words than those of the Confession would have to be used in saying so. These words mean something else.

In thesis 8 we meet the expression, "Therefore we should judge concerning this our election." "Our election" could indeed be understood as though the elect were undoubtedly certain of the fact of their election. But, if we take for granted that such is the case, the sense of the whole expression, "judge concerning this our election", would not yet be, "search whether we are elected", but would still remain, "judge concerning our election itself how matters stand in regard to it." In the following, accordingly, we find a false idea of election, and not a false answer to the question, as to whether I am elected, given as the result of "judging concerning our election" from reason or from the law.

And now the sentence follows: "But the true judgment concerning predestination must be learned alone from the Holy Gospel concerning Christ." We ask, what must be learned from the Holy Gospel? This, that I am elected? No; as we have seen, this cannot be what the Confession wishes to say by these expressions. But we are told at once what we must learn from the Holy Gospel: "In which it is clearly testified that God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all, and that He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance and believe in the Lord Christ."

Can any one learn from this that he personally is elected in preference to others? Can it be this then that we are bidden to learn from the Holy Gospel concerning Christ? Impossible! For we have two universal propositions here: 1) He is not willing that any should perish; 2) It is His will that all should come to repentance and believe. From this we can well learn, 1) that

in election also God surely omitted no one whom He could elect; 2) that He surely elected no one without making sure (humanly speaking) that the person would believe. The limits within which God elected men unto salvation are thus stated. The Latin text of the Confession is even more explicit; verbally translated, we read: "The true judgment concerning predestination must be learned from the Gospel of Christ."

These words our opponents cannot subject to their interpretation; for "the true judgment concerning predestination" is surely not identical with their wonderful certainty concerning their own personal election? On the contrary, the right idea, the correct conception of election itself must be drawn from the gospel; the lines within which, and the rule according to which God elected, is there given. Consequently, "the true judgment concerning predestination must be learned from the gospel of Christ." For this gospel clearly testifies that God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all; and that He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. Rom. 11, 32; Ez. 18, 23; 33, 11; 2 Pet. 3, 9; 1 John 2, 2."

What therefore is the first and most important thing that we must learn from the gospel, in order to get the true judgment or the correct idea concerning election? Answer: That God is not willing that any should perish, which is the universal will of grace. Why is this so necessary for the correct definition of election, even though all men are not elected? We can speak of the universal will of grace in its own proper place; what has it to do here? Very much! Certainly, all are not elected; but I am to know and must know that this is not due to any lack in God — and this also in election. From this side no limitation was imposed.

The second thing, necessary for the correct definition of election, which must be learned from the gospel is this: It is God's will, that all should come to repentance and believe in Christ. Without this God will save no one. This then is where we might expect a limitation of election. And here is where we find it indeed. For we indeed read: It is His will that all should come to repentance and believe on Christ, wherefore He calls to Himself all sinners and is anxious that all men should come to Him and permit Him to help them, and hence wishes them to hear the Word, and promises besides the power and efficiency

of the Holy Ghost, and divine assistance for perseverance and eternal salvation (thesis 7); accordingly, the grace of conversion also and of preservation in the faith necessary for salvation is in no way limited — there is no election unto the call and unto faith, ye friends — on the contrary: How often would I have gathered you, i. e. desired to bring you unto faith, but ye would not. Matt. 23. Here is the limitation! And since we are to get the true judgment concerning election from these statements, that judgment can only be: God did indeed desire to predestinate all men unto salvation, yet no man without faith; but all do not believe although He calls them earnestly and efficaciously; consequently, He did not predestinate all, but elected only a few, yet only believers, those who believe till the end. It is on this account that we read in thesis 4: "The predestination or eternal election of God is occupied only with the godly, beloved children of God." Belief and unbelief — not a mysterious will of God — made the distinction also in election. He who believes shall be saved, this is the rule revealed in the gospel. And from the gospel the true judgment concerning election must be learned; so then this is the rule of election. This is what our Confession means, and what we mean when we join our Confession in declaring: Election is revealed in the gospel.

They who will not judge concerning election from the gospel can judge concerning it only from reason or from the law, as thesis 8 declares; and both of these "lead either into a dissipated, dissolute epicurean life, or into despair, and would excite in the heart of men pernicious thoughts (and such thoughts cannot be effectually guarded against as long as they follow their own reason), so that they think to themselves: If God has elected me to salvation, I cannot be condemned, although I do whatever I will. And again: If I am not elected to eternal life, it matters not what good I do, for my efforts are nevertheless all in vain."

These thoughts our Confession rejects as pernicious products of reason. But what is there false about them according to Missourian doctrine? Does not Missouri use almost identical language? "If God has elected me to salvation, I cannot be condemned, although I do whatever I will." Very naturally our opponents do not say that the elect can do whatever they will. But the question is whether those who have really imbibed their doctrine must not necessarily arrive at such thoughts. They

undoubtedly must, and even the words of Missouri say almost as much. In the Report of '79, p. 38, they say "that God gives to the elect a richer grace than to the non-elect." And this richer grace they then describe as "grace unto perseverance." They go on to say that "fathers also deal in the same way," preferring one child to another, of course the one that obeys best. And they conclude their entire line of thought by saying: "In the same way God deals with us, only He does not even ask whether we have obeyed or not, but does as He pleases." Note well, this does not refer to conversion or justification, as to whether God asked there in regard to our having obeyed or not; this speaks of the grace of perseverance, of the preservation in faith of those who are already justified and children of God. Even these God treats arbitrarily, showing to some paternal faithfulness, i. e. actually saving them, as He has promised to all in Baptism, but declining to preserve others, and this without asking whether they, as children, have obeyed or not. Whomever He preserves "shall and must" be saved, whether he has obeyed or not. Is not this the identical thought of reason: "If God has elected me, I cannot be condemned, although I do whatever I will"? Where is the difference?

"These shall and must be saved," is what the Report of '77 says. These "cannot be condemned," is what reason declares. That is identical. "Whether we have obeyed or not," is the phrase in the Report of '79. "Although I do whatever I will," is the expression of reason. That again is identical. We have already repeatedly referred to what Christ is said to have declared to Peter "and to all the elect," namely that, even though they deny Christ with curses and perjury, they shall and must obtain faith again, for they shall and must be saved. Therefore, the most abominable sins cannot harm the elect as far as their salvation is concerned. Is this exactly identical with the thoughts of reason, only expressed more repulsively and harshly: "If I am elected, I cannot be condemned, although I do whatever I will"?

But, of course, we must not imagine that Missouri would preach such flagrant wickedness. O no; they warn against sins; they hold up God's wrath and judgment to wilful sinners, they exercise discipline, and hold fast the distinction between wilful sins and sins of weakness as decisive in the question, whether a person can still be a believing child of God (who would there-

fore not dare be excommunicated) or not. Missouri abominates what follows from its doctrine of election, just as much as we do. But when it states its doctrine of predestination, all consideration is gone. The wagon has sunken too deeply into the Calvinistic rut, they cannot haul it out; and before they know it, they themselves utter sentences of which afterwards they must be ashamed, and then they pretend they did not mean what they have said and revile us for holding such things up to them, and yet they continue to utter similar offensive sentences; because they will not learn the true judgments concerning election from the gospel, they "cannot effectually guard against such thoughts," as our Confession declares.

We have the same thing in regard to the opposite proposition: "If I am not elected to eternal life, it matters not what good I do; for my efforts are nevertheless all in vain." Missouri has said the very same thing, only in words far harsher and more offensive. "If I do not belong to the elect, I may hear God's Word ever so diligently, receive absolution, and go to the Lord's Supper, it is all of no avail; this is certainly so." If I am not elected, everything is of no avail, is the conclusion of reason. If I am not elected, everything is of no avail, is the conclusion of Missouri. Our Confession declares this to be false, and can so declare it, since it views election on the broad basis of universal grace, and forms its judgment concerning election from the gospel of Christ; for this shows us that no man is excluded from salvation, or from election, who does not exclude himself. It is true, he who is not elected will not be saved. But he will not be saved and he is not elected for this reason, and for this alone, that he does not "hear God's Word diligently," or that he does not abide by that Word. The lips of eternal truth themselves have uttered the word: Blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it. But Missouri must add according to its doctrine: But if he is not elected the hearing will be of no avail, and the keeping must flow from election. Thus the doctrine of election without the foresight of faith turns everything topsy turvy and places a heavy question mark behind every divine promise, i. e. "Are you elected?" And yet Missouri cannot prove to a single person that he is elected, and simply lets him "stick fast in this truth (?)," as it declares very pertinently regarding its godless statements.

Thesis 10 of the Epitome reads as follows:

10) "To him, therefore, who is really concerned about the revealed will of God, and proceeds according to the order which St. Paul has observed in the Epistle to the Romans, who first directs men to repentance, knowledge of sins, to faith in Christ, to divine obedience, before he speaks of the mystery of the eternal election of God, this doctrine is useful and consolatory."

Here the revealed will of God and the mystery of eternal election are distinguished from each other; first comes the former, then the latter. This passage furnishes more of a pretext to our opponents for their "mystery" than anything else they are able to adduce from the Confession. And yet the words are easily understood from what has been said above, they also explain themselves sufficiently; for they again state that beyond and without the Word of the gospel we cannot speak in a salutary and consolatory way concerning election. In itself election, like every other work of divine grace, is an unsearchable mystery. It took place before the foundation of the world. It would be impossible for us to assert that we know anything whatever about it, if it had not been revealed to us. But if the mere fact had been revealed, that God from the beginning chose only a few, this would be unutterably terrible; it would not "hover like a wonderful mystery over certain persons," but like an awful mystery over all. We would then be unable "effectually to guard against the thoughts" already referred to in the Confession, thoughts which constantly reappear in the Missourian doctrine; namely: If I am elected, sin cannot harm me; if I am not elected, no means of grace can help me, "it will all be in vain" — "everything is of no avail." But the mystery here spoken of in the Confession is revealed — not in a revelation differing from the gospel, but in the gospel itself. And if I have carefully learned the statements which the gospel clearly declares, that God is not willing that any should perish, and on the other hand that He will save no one without faith, then I have learned the true judgment concerning election, even though I had never heard the word "election" itself. And when now I hear in addition that God predestinated, i. e. foreordained all this already before the foundation of the world, and that He even elected the persons themselves in whom all this shall be fulfilled unto salvation, such doctrine will be "salutary and consolatory" for me — and this not again election as distinguished from the gospel, but "this doctrine," or as § 14 of the

Sol. Decl. has it: "The entire doctrine . . . pertaining to our redemption, call, righteousness, and salvation." "Useful and consolatory" not because I have thus learned to know a different source from the universal love of God and the wounds of Christ from which my salvation, and just mine, is said to flow, as Missouri and the Calvinists dream; but "salutary and consolatory" because I now, as it were, look more deeply into the true source of salvation, when I see that even before the foundation of the world God has made provision for my salvation and for all the means of salvation, that, as the Sol. Decl. declares, § 45, He "was so solicitous concerning the conversion, righteousness, and salvation of every Christian, and so faithfully provided therefor, that before the foundation of the world was laid He deliberated concerning it, and in His purpose ordained how He would bring me thereto and preserve me therein."

This is a passage Missouri likes especially to adduce for its election unto faith. But it does not say that God made such provision for the conversion only of the elect, but for the conversion, etc., "of every Christian." And God has established the means of grace, as we saw in thesis 7, not for the Christians alone, but for all men alike. Here, however, the word is "of every Christian" because the passage speaks of the consolation. Those who are not Christians cannot console themselves with eternal election. But those who are Christians can all console themselves with the fact, that from eternity God "so faithfully provided therefor," i. e. for their conversion. "Also, that He wished to secure my salvation so well and certainly that since, through the weakness and wickedness of our flesh, it could easily be lost from our hands, or through craft and might of the devil and the world be torn or removed therefrom, in His eternal purpose, which cannot fail or be overthrown" (although we ourselves can turn away, § 32, whereby, however, the purpose would not be overthrown, since it is not His purpose to save wilful despisers of His grace), "He ordained it, and placed it for preservation in the almighty hand of our Savior Jesus Christ, from which no one can pluck us (John 10, 28). Hence Paul also says (Rom. 8, 28, 39): Because we have been called according to the purpose of God, who will separate us from the love of God in Christ?"

God Himself has provided everything, there is nothing left for us to do, in the fullest sense of the word "all things are ready."

Christ, the Son of God and our Savior, sits at the right hand of God, and has all His and our foes beneath His feet. All power in heaven and on earth is given to Him, and besides He intercedes for us with His powerful prayers. This is fulness of consolation. And in this way this doctrine is useful and consolatory. But the consolation sought in election by Missouri, namely that they cannot possibly be lost, even though they should again fall into grossest sin — this consolation no sober Christian desires to have. He is sure of the grace of God in Christ, and in this he rejoices; he knows too that God will omit nothing, and this he knows for the very reason, that all the promises of God regarding preservation in faith apply to every Christian, even to those who through their own guilt fall away, and therefore election in no way troubles his heart except in the hour of temptation; he has a straight path before him, although one that is also strait, and he knows with unconditional certainty that this path leads to heaven. Although he does not see the end of that path at present, he knows that by daily contrition and repentance he draws nigh to that blessed end step by step, and is already saved, yet saved by hope, Rom. 8, 24. Missouri is not in this blessed position. It has two ways to heaven, the universal counsel of grace, by which a person may indeed obtain faith and be preserved for 40 or 50 years; but this way does not reach the blessed goal entirely, it lacks the grace of perseverance — and the second which is the particular counsel of election; this alone leads completely to the goal. Evidently, Missouri is compelled from the very start to search out on which of these two ways it is traveling; constantly attempts to see the end of its way from the beginning, i. e. to become certain of its election; clambers up steep hights, gazes out into the gray mists, and declares: This is the wonderful mystery that hovers over us, yea over us especially! and looks down with pity upon the pilgrims "wearily plodding along" deep down in the valley and perhaps imagining that this valley road is the only safe one to heaven! Well, dear friends, we hope to see you clamber down again and join us in the valley; perhaps the hour of death will teach you to come down. Meanwhile, be careful not to lose sight altogether of the universal way of salvation, lest you fail to find it again in the hour of need.

We have already discussed thesis 11 of the Epitome. For the sake of continuity we repeat it again: —

11) "That, however, many are called, few are chosen, does not mean that God is unwilling that all should be saved, but the reason is that they either do not at all hear God's Word, but wilfully despise it, close their ears and harden their hearts, and in this manner foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in them, or, when it is heard, they consider it of no account, and do not heed it. For this not God or His election, but their wickedness, is responsible."

The importance of this thesis will be apparent to all who have noted the fundamental thought the Confession desires to convey. According to thesis 9, if we would learn the "true judgment concerning election," we must above all begin by learning from the Gospel of Christ that God is not willing that any should perish. This is not, as our opponents claim, something which must also be believed, although impossible of being harmonized with the doctrine of election—no; this is in such perfect "harmony" with election that it constitutes the very sun and center of the whole doctrine of election. For me everything depends on knowing whether, when God selected the persons for salvation, He proceeded according to His universal love, which He offers me in the Gospel, or whether He narrowed this love in making the selection. The question is by no means useless or presumptuous, why God did not ordain all men unto salvation; on the contrary, it refers to the very foundation of our faith. Our opponents tell us not to bother about the fate of the non-elect, but to be satisfied with our own salvation. That is exceedingly cool language; and they pretend great humility and resignation in not attempting to scrutinize the secret counsel of God. But, but the great question is: Does this, why God elected only a few, belong to His secret counsel? And secondly, the question arises—which our opponents have not as yet answered satisfactorily: How am I to know that God really intends to save me, when, in the very thing which is all-decisive, He did not proceed according to what He has revealed concerning Himself? I have received no revelation which temporary believers have not likewise received. I am therefore in the same boat with them, and cannot say: I will not bother about them when their boat sinks. If the fault of their non-election lies in them, if this is a fault we can avoid through the grace of God, then indeed I have all reason to be afraid of my flesh and blood, which is no better than that of other

people. But then I need not doubt concerning God's gracious will. The boat itself does not sink; they who perish are lost by jumping overboard of their own accord. But if it is a mystery of the divine will, why in the all-decisive moment many were omitted, even such as are faithful Christians for 40 or 50 years, then—where am I to find a solid hold?

Well, our Confession knows nothing of any such mystery. It takes as the foundation of the doctrine of election God's universal will of grace, as we have seen above, and now proceeds to answer the question in thesis 11, why only a few are elected. The idea is "not that God is unwilling that all should be saved"; the cause for the election of only a few is that many wilfully despise the divine Word, harden their hearts, etc. This is precisely what we "opponents" say. Whereas our Confession answers the extremely important question, Missouri declares, it does not know why God did not elect the rest, thus grossly contradicting the Confession. Then they go about to twist and turn the words of the Confession, as though these words do not give the reason, why only a few are elected, but simply mean to show why God saves only a few in time. He does not save the greater number, they say, because they do not believe; they do not attain constant faith because they despise the Word and resist the Holy Ghost. Yet, they claim, God could have prevented this action, if He had elected them. But the reason, why He did not elect them, they claim not to know! It is easy for any one to see that they shamefully pervert the words: "That, however, many are called, few are chosen, does not mean that God is unwilling that all should be saved, but the reason is, etc." It is certainly beyond comprehension how any sensible person can refer these latter words to the foregoing, "unwilling that all should be saved." The point at issue is evidently the correct interpretation of the passage: Many are called, few are chosen. The Confession begins by warding off a false interpretation: This does not mean that God is unwilling that all should be saved. Thereupon the correct explanation is introduced by "but": "but the reason is." The passage which is to be explained Missouri passes by, and refers the explanation given, to the second clause, which clause is not meant to be explained at all in the Confession, but to be totally and completely rejected! This exegetical feat was per-

formed by P. Stoeckhardt in Chicago, and the other savants accepted it in silence!

But, to be sure, they know what is at stake. This thesis subverts their entire doctrine of election. Where the "reason" can be given, the mystery disappears; and if the reason for the non-election of many is their despising the Word, then God considered the conduct of men toward the means of grace in election, in fact, He considered persevering faith, for this is the "work of the Holy Ghost", which He cannot effect in those who wilfully despise the Word. Furthermore, if the Holy Ghost cannot effect His work in certain people then there is no so-called free election unto faith, as Missouri dreams. Even if we would explain the phrase, "election unto faith", correctly and would then suffer it to pass, the explanation would have to declare that God elected all those unto faith—of whom He foresaw that they would not foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost. In a word, thesis 11 of our Confession also upsets the Missourian doctrine of election. Not a particle is left standing. Missouri's fundamental principles are false; its doctrine of predestination stands outside of the revealed Gospel, therefore every letter of it must necessarily be false; and even the correct expressions which Missouri still retains receive a false construction in their new connection, viz. "God has elected in grace," which Missouri still uses. Missouri does not mean the grace which Christ has obtained for all sinners, but a particular, special grace of election. God has elected in Christ; this is not to signify that God considered who would be in Christ through faith, as the phrase is used for instance in Rom. 8, 1: "There is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." Of what benefit are the orthodox phrases when retained, as long as their orthodox signification is explained away?

Thesis 12 of the Epitome reads as follows:—

12) "Moreover, a Christian should apply himself to the article concerning the eternal election of God, so far as it has been revealed in God's Word, which presents Christ to us as the Book of Life, which, by the preaching of the holy Gospel, He opens and spreads out to us, as it is written: Whom He did predestinate, them He also called. In Him, therefore, we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who, in His eternal divine counsel, determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him.

Other thoughts are to be entirely banished, as they proceed not from God, but from the suggestion of Satan, whereby he attempts to weaken or to entirely remove from us the glorious consolation which we have in this salutary doctrine, viz. that we know that out of pure grace, without any merit of our own, we have been elected in Christ to eternal life, and that no one can pluck us out of His hand; as He has promised this gracious election not only with mere words, but has also certified it with an oath, and sealed it with the holy Sacraments, which we can call to mind in our most severe temptations, and from them comfort ourselves, and thereby quench the fiery darts of the devil."

This is properly the end of the discussion itself; theses 13 and 14 contain only admonitions and applications.

A Christian should apply himself to this article . . . other thoughts are to be entirely banished, as they proceed not from God. Then the chief thoughts are again repeated: So far as election is revealed in God's Word; for the Word presents Christ to us as the Book of Life; which, by the preaching of the Gospel He opens and spreads out to us, i. e. from the Gospel we learn what God has determined in Christ. From this it follows that we should seek election in Christ, i. e. believe in Christ. That this is meant the Sol. Decl. shows in § 66, where the same expression occurs: "Therefore the entire Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, direct all men to Christ as the Book of Life, in which they"—all men—"should seek the eternal election of the Father." This can only mean that all are to believe in Christ. Wherefore thesis 12 at once proceeds: "Who, in His eternal divine counsel determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son Christ and truly believe on Him."

In brief, then: Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, "all men"—whoever does not believe cannot be saved. This is the way in which the counsel of God in Christ is opened up and spread out to us in the preaching of the holy Gospel. All other thoughts are to be entirely banished; that is all we know of election—it is, as has been said, the rule according to which God elected, the universal will of grace to save all men, yet only through faith in Christ. This agrees with thesis 9: "The true judgment concerning predestination must be learned alone from the holy Gospel concerning Christ, in which it is clearly testified

that God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all, and that He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance and believe in Christ." This agrees also with the way in which our Confession takes up any passage from the Gospel, even though not a word be said of eternity, or of certain persons, or of election, and declares that in all such passages election is revealed; viz. § 65 of the Sol. Decl.: "But this election is revealed from heaven through the preached Word when the Father says: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him. And Christ says: Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. And concerning the Holy Ghost Christ says: He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." In these passages election is revealed to us! Yes, says Missouri, they reveal to us, the elect, that we are elected. Impossible! for the Confession at once continues: "Therefore"—this is what these passages show—"therefore the entire Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, direct all men to Christ . . . for it has been decided by the Father from eternity that whom He would save He would save through Christ." Nothing is said here about "certain persons", the words state a universal rule; not a wonderful mystery regarding certain persons "is revealed from heaven", but "the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to His saints, Col. 1, 26; which is Christ in you," v. 27.

Furthermore, § 67: "But Christ" (to whom all men are directed) "as the only-begotten Son of God, who is in the bosom of the Father, has published to us the will of the Father, and thus also our eternal election to eternal life, viz. when He says: Repent ye and believe the Gospel; the kingdom of God is at hand. He also says: This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have everlasting life. And again: God so loved the world, etc." The Father's will Christ has revealed to us (in the Gospel) and thus also our eternal election. But what is the Father's will? "Repent ye and believe"—"That every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have everlasting life"—"God so loved the world, etc." How do these passages reveal to us—to "all men"—our eternal election? The rule, according to which God elected, is revealed to us. He who cannot see that must be

struck with special blindness. He who does not want to see it is beyond help. Should not St. Louis go to work in earnest to bring itself into "harmony" with the Confession? The Confession certainly will not come to them, they must return to the Confession, for they have left it. They have run themselves fast by their false interpretation of § 8: "Election is a cause which procures, etc., our salvation and all that pertains thereto." "Election" must mean, they claim, discretio personarum, the mysterious separation of persons; it "procures our salvation and all that pertains thereto" must mean: God has elected these unto the call and unto faith. They will not understand that the very thing the Confession does not mean by "election" is the separation of persons, but first of all and above all the universal will of grace, the grace of God in Christ without which predestination is altogether inconceivable; they will not understand this, although the Confession repeats it in almost every paragraph. They cannot "harmonize" what the Confession says, when it speaks of the election of a "few", and brings in what pertains to all, and yet they themselves cannot deny that they are elected "in Christ." They indeed understand this expression differently from the way in which the Church has understood it hitherto, but we pass this as of no moment for the present question. "In Christ" certainly signifies, In Him who is the Redeemer of all men. Surely they will not divide Christ Himself? However artfully they may twist the little word "in", surely they not attempt to alter anything in "Christ." Very well then, as long as they do not deny that Christ is the Redeemer of all men, and nevertheless are compelled to take Him into the doctrine of election, they themselves have something in the doctrine of election which pertains to all men. As long as they cannot claim a special redemption of the elect—what necessitates their claim of a special call?

But they claim to have irrefragable(?) proof for this assertion; for does not § 5 of the Sol. Decl. (thesis 4 of the Epit.) read as follows: "The eternal election of God or predestination pertains not at the same time to the godly and the wicked"? Reference is here had to the predestination of those who are actually saved. And a little further on we are told that this same predestination is a cause which procures our salvation and whatever pertains thereto. The call through the Gospel, faith, and perseverance pertains to salvation. All this, therefore, Missouri

tells us, is procured and wrought by predestination "which pertains not at the same time to all men." Consequently, God must have elected and predestinated—these to whom election pertains unto all this—just these, not the rest; otherwise predestination or election would apply to all. This is how our opponents demonstrate and prove their election unto faith.

Now all this has a very fine appearance, and they have succeeded in confounding the entire synod by these two paragraphs, that is by their false interpretation of them. That Dr. Walther, although originally misunderstanding § 8, still interpreted it in an orthodox way, we have already seen when we spoke of his Postille.

What now can we find to object in the above demonstration? How can we escape its conclusions? How much do we admit, and how much do we reject? We will answer clearly and distinctly; but to preface our answer we will state a few general objections against the argumentation, which perhaps may induce our opponents to examine our answer more carefully than they have done hitherto. 1) Such a predestination of some certain persons unto the call and unto faith is nowhere revealed to us in the Gospel of Christ. Yet the Confession states that election is revealed in the Gospel. If this were an election unto the call and unto faith it would have to be revealed as such in the Gospel, and that too in the passages quoted by the Confession: This is my beloved Son—Come unto me—Repent ye—This is the will of—God so loved the world; etc. In these passages election is revealed! 2) Election or predestination is a cause which procures and works our salvation and whatever pertains thereto. It accordingly procures and works in the first place our salvation itself and then all that pertains therto; or we can say briefly, it procures all that was and that is necessary to save sinners. Redemption was necessary above all things for salvation, not merely conversion and preservation. Our Confession proceeds to name in order all the different things "that pertain thereto", and begins by naming redemption. Accordingly, our opponents are compelled to assert an election of individual persons unto redemption as well as unto the call. Do they want this? They do not. Therefore, even though we should be unable to disprove and refute their deduction above, we would still be able to say: You fall into the same ditch you have dug for us. Faith is not the

only thing that "pertains" to salvation, but above all redemption. If then you prove from the words of the Confession an election of some unto faith, you thereby prove in the same way an election of some unto redemption. If you do not want the latter, cease troubling us with the former. The one agrees with the Gospel in which election is revealed as little as the other. Both paragraphs must, therefore, certainly mean something else. And now our answer:—

1) Our Confession uses two words, "election" and "predestination", as synonymous, and defines both as "God's appointment unto salvation", § 5.

2) By this appointment unto salvation it does not understand the mere discretio personarum, least of all in the Missourian fashion. The "dis. pers.", i. e. the separation of persons, belongs to God's "appointment", but much else also belongs to it, and this separation is not by far the foremost part of the "appointment." § 13 and 14 states that, if we would speak concerning the election or appointment of the children of God unto eternal life, we are to speak of it as "the counsel, purpose, and ordination of God in Christ Jesus, who is the true book of life, has been revealed to us through the Word, viz. that the entire doctrine concerning the purpose, counsel, will, and ordination of God pertaining to our redemption, call, righteousness, and salvation should be taken together . . . . that God in His purpose and counsel decreed." Note the word "decreed" and also the word "ordination", they are one and the same with "appointment", in German "verordnet", "Verordnung." The contents of the appointment or predestination, which the Confession takes as synonymous with "election," is now given. What then did God appoint, what all is to be embraced by election or predestination? Eight eternal decrees: 1) of redemption; 2) of the call; 3) of the mission of the Holy Ghost for conversion; etc.; 8) of glorification in eternal life. This is the entire counsel of salvation, the contents of the whole gospel, as every one sees at a glance. All this "God has appointed in His purpose and counsel", all of it forms the contents of "God's appointment unto eternal life", which is also designated as election or predestination. See § 5.

3) Now it is clear how § 8 must be understood: Election is a cause which procures and works our salvation and all that pertains thereto. God has "appointed" before the foundation of the world redemption, the call, conversion, justification, sanctification,

preservation in faith, and finally entrance into eternal life; and what He appoints He — not we — carries out in time. The meaning of § 9 is therefore beyond all doubt; election vel praedestinatio, that is "God's appointment unto salvation" includes more than the discretio personarum of Missouri.

4) Now we inquire how this harmonizes with § 5, which states that election or God's appointment to salvation does not at the same time pertain to the godly and the wicked. If the eight decrees describe the universal counsel of grace, in other words, if God's eternal election vel praedestinatio embraces the universal counsel of grace — which our opponents deny — which we, however, have proven — how then can we say that election vel praedestinatio does not pertain to all men? Would not this be denying that the universal counsel of grace pertains to all men, that all are redeemed, called, etc.? This is what our opponents claim, and they imagine that they have bound us fast. And yet the case is very simple. This "election vel praedestinatio" embraces eight decrees. The eighth reads: "That those whom He has elected, called, and justified, He would eternally save and glorify in life eternal." This, as the following paragraph shows clearly, speaks of definite persons who are elected and appointed unto eternal life. And this discretio personarum — which is not at all mysterious, but is instituted according to the order prescribed in the foregoing decrees — this appointment of persons unto eternal life belongs also to election vel praedestinatio; in fact this appointment of individual definite persons has furnished the name of the whole series of decrees, namely election or predestination. Therefore, even though a person should be redeemed, called, and converted, election or predestination will not for that reason alone pertain to him, unless he perseveres and thus is brought under the 8th decree. The universal counsel of grace alone is not "election vel praedestinatio", although it constitutes the order and the rule according to which God elected and predes-destinated; and in so far the Confession can say: Election is revealed to us in the gospel, for instance in the passage: God so loved the world . . . . that whosoever believeth should not perish, but have everlasting life. Here we have the universal will of grace with its condition, namely those who believe in Christ shall be saved. Here we have the rule and the order according to which God saves some in time and does not save others; and at the same time, since God's will is immutable, we have here the

rule and order according to which He elected some in eternity unto salvation and did not elect others — otherwise the Confession could not say: Eternal election is revealed to us in this passage and in the gospel in general. He who believes not, or who believes not till the end (for this too is the sense of the passage), is included indeed in the universal counsel of grace and in the rule contained therein, but is not elected or appointed of God unto eternal life. In a word, "election vel praedestinatio" embraces the universal counsel of grace together with the appointment of those persons who are actually saved. An election or appointment of persons unto salvation without the universal counsel of grace is altogether inconceivable. Yet the latter standing by itself is not yet "election vel praedestinatio."

Thus election pertains, according to § 5, not to all at the same time, and is nevertheless the cause, which according to § 8 procures our salvation, and is prepared for all.

If our opponents cannot or —will not acknowledge this as the correct solution, they may seek the solution themselves. They shall never disprove that "election vel praedestinatio" is the cause also of redemption, according to § 8 and §§ 13-24. But how this can be made to harmonize with the statement that election vel praedestinatio is occupied only with the elect — this question they may answer for themselves; and it is precisely the question they direct to us. Their writings show that they have constantly felt the difficulty, and the same thing appeared at the Conference in Ft. Wayne. They do not know how to find a place for universal redemption in election vel praedestinatio. At one time they say it is the foundation of predestination, which is certainly correct, when the word election, as is done by our dogmaticians, is taken in its narrowest signification as only the selection of persons. But in this case our opponents cannot say that they are speaking after the manner of the F. C.; in this case they cannot at all say that election is a cause, and our salvation that which is caused, which also lies in the words "redemption is the foundation." To speak of three causes of salvation: God's grace, redemption, and predestination, is altogether contrary to the Scriptures and the Confession. Moreover, the Confession does not name redemption as the foundation of election or of the appointment unto salvation, but as the first thing which has been "appointed" (or ordained) in this appointment; as we have been repeating and re-repeating to our opponents now for over two years; and the

only thing they are able to reply is to rehash their empty assertions. Only one attempt was made at a solution, by P. Stoeckhardt in "L. u. W.", May, 1880, and to this we referred above when we stated that at one time our opponents made redemption the foundation. He writes: "Redemption, which pertains to the whole human race, is at the same time the means for carrying out the counsel of election." That certainly is very, very dubious language. Then perhaps the counsel of election, i. e. the intention to save only a few, was the original thought of God? The thought need not surprise us in our opponents, for they are constantly being pushed by their doctrine to speak of redemption as though it has been intended from the very start only for a few. And indeed it cannot matter much after all they have already said; for, if God from the very start limited the grace of conversion and preservation only to a few, for all the rest "everything will be of no avail" anyhow, not only the Word, Absolution, the Lord's Supper, but also redemption. Our opponents cannot deceive us by their attempt at holding fast: "Redemption pertains to the whole human race"; for what can redemption benefit those who are not included in the "counsel of election" which they say is to be carried out by redemption as a "means"? At any rate "means for carrying out the counsel of election" is never identical with "foundation of the counsel of election." This is the way our opponents contradict themselves, and that in the very chief questions of the whole doctrine. The reason for this is that their doctrine of election is false in general. They fail to agree with the dogmaticians by separating from predestination the foresight of faith, in the signification generally given to this term. They likewise fail to agree with the F. C. by separating the universal counsel of grace from predestination. Thus they have left to constitute what they call "election" the mere naked discretio personarum, the mere "review", as it is called in § 9 of F. C., according to the absolute will of God. In general we must say, they grope about altogether in the dark, since they will not agree that election is revealed in the gospel; and now they rejoice in a "wonderful mystery hovering over certain persons." He who likes may join them! We find our election revealed everywhere in the gospel, for instance in the passage: God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. And should the question be asked of us, as it was asked of the writer the other day by a Missourian pastor:

"What does the gospel benefit me, if God does not give me faith?" (the question precisely as here given and repeated a second time with emphasis!) we simply declare such language to be blasphemy; for to every man to whom God gives the gospel He thereby also, as much as lieth in Him, gives faith. But this is what the doctrine of Missouri concerning election unto faith really implies; there is always the question whether, when a man hears the gospel God will really give him faith and preserve him in that faith. The question asked by the Mo. pastor is evidently only another form for the old assertion, if I do not belong to the elect, I may hear God's Word (the gospel) ever so diligently . . . . it is all of no avail.

For an unprejudiced reader there can be no doubt whatever as to the meaning of our Confession when it declares, election is revealed in the gospel, or Christ has proclaimed to us the will of the Father and thus also our eternal election, when He declares: Repent ye and believe the gospel. If this is to mean, as Mo. must interpret it: Ye that hear this are actually appointed unto eternal life! then all who do hear it would thus be appointed, all the called. But Mo. itself does not want this, nor would it agree with the words of Christ: Many are called, few are chosen. Hence the words can only mean: It is God's will that all men should repent and be saved. And they who do repent and believe in Christ, but only they, are actually elected and appointed unto salvation. This was the rule employed in eternal election, which is the purpose and will of God according to which He saves in time and elected unto salvation in eternity. The purpose of election, the rule of election is revealed to us in such passages. If this is not revealed in them, then they contain no revelation at all concerning election; Missouri does not know what to do with all these declarations of the Confession, except to pretend that the Confession would have the elect become certain of their election through such passages! "The Father's will and thus also our election" is to mean "the personal certainty of the elect"! Such is the renowned faithful adherence of modern Mo. to the Confession; and all who do not chime in are miserable fellows who have broken their ordination vows! Very well, gentlemen, the day of settlement is coming fast; we are in a position to await undisturbed what it shall bring forth!

We now need merely to quote the passage from the Sol.

Decl., which summarizes precisely what election "comprises" and what "belongs thereto." It is found in §§ 13-24.

"Therefore, if we wish to think or speak correctly and profitably concerning eternal election, or the predestination and foreordination of the children of God to eternal life, we should accustom ourselves not to speculate concerning the mere, secret, concealed, inscrutible foreknowledge of God, but how the counsel, purpose, and ordination of God in Christ Jesus, who is the true Book of Life, has been revealed to us through the Word, viz. that the entire doctrine concerning the purpose, counsel, will and ordination of God pertaining to our redemption, call, righteousness, and salvation, should be taken together; as Paul has treated and explained this article (Rom. 8, Eph. 1), as also Christ in the parable (Matt. 22), namely that God in His purpose and counsel decreed:—

"1. That the human race should be truly redeemed and reconciled with God through Christ, who, by His faultless obedience, suffering and death, has merited for us righteousness which avails before God, and eternal life."

"2. That such merit and benefits of Christ should be offered, presented, and distributed to us through His Word and sacraments."

"3. That He would be efficacious and active in us by His Holy Ghost, through the Word, when it is preached, heard and pondered, to convert hearts to true repentance and preserve them in the true faith."

"4. That all those who, in true repentance, receive Christ by a true faith He would justify and receive into grace, adoption, and inheritance of eternal life."

"5. That those also who are thus justified He would sanctify in love, as St. Paul says (Eph. 1, 4)."

"6. That, in their great weakness, He also would defend them against the devil, the world, and the flesh, and would rule and lead them in His ways, and when they stumble would raise them again, and under the cross and in temptation would comfort and preserve them."

"7. That the good work which He has begun in them He would strengthen, increase, and support to the end, if they observe God's Word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness, and faithfully use the gifts received."

"8. That those whom He has elected, called, and justified, He would eternally save and glorify in life eternal."

"And that in His counsel, purpose, and ordination He prepared salvation not only in general, but in grace considered and chose to salvation each and every person of the elect, who shall be saved through Christ, and ordained that in the way just mentioned He would by His grace, gifts, and efficacy bring them thereto, and aid, promote, strengthen, and preserve them."

"All this, according to the Scriptures, is comprised in the doctrine concerning the eternal election of God to adoption and eternal salvation, and should be comprised with it, and not omitted, when we speak of God's purpose, predestination, election, and ordination to salvation. And when, according to the Scriptures, thoughts concerning this article are thus formed, we can, by God's grace, simply adapt ourselves to it."

The preceding 8 eternal decrees evidently state the entire contents of the gospel. They show as well how God prepared salvation for all sinners, so that all can actually be converted, justified, and saved, as also how God has determined to save and glorify in eternal life only those who by true repentance and faith receive Christ, and persevere in such faith till the end. They also show how first of all we come to this faith and then how we are preserved therein, namely through the work of the Holy Spirit alone without any co-operation of man, yet not without the use of the means of grace; for in the third decree, which treats of conversion, we read: "When the Word is preached, heard and pondered"; and in the seventh, treating of preservation: "If they observe God's Word," etc. Accordingly our salvation from beginning to end lies in God's hand, and there can be no thought of merit or co-operation on our part. None of these decrees, however, shows that the grace of God unto conversion and preservation is irresistible, nor that God has unconditionally elected a certain number of men in preference to the rest unto conversion, and has ordained that these must necessarily be converted, as Missouri would have it. There is a passage in the Confession which, when torn from its connection, appears to favor this view, and our opponents have utilized it abundantly. It reads as follows (§ 40): "But as God has ordained in His counsel that the Holy Ghost should call, enlighten, and convert the elect through the Word," . . . He will, etc. But the connection shows abundantly how this is

meant, when we read in what precedes: "Therefore the opinion should in no way be entertained . . . that these should be the elect, even though they despise the Word of God, reject, calumniate, and persecute it, or when they hear it harden their hearts, resist the Holy Ghost, etc. — But as God has ordained in His counsel that the Holy Ghost should call, enlighten, and convert the elect through the Word, and that all those who, through true faith, receive Christ He will justify and save; He has also determined in His counsel that He will harden, reprobate, and condemn those who are called through the Word, if they reject the Word and resist the Holy Ghost, who wishes to be efficacious and to work in them through the Word."

The elaboration of the thought in the sentence, "and that all those who, through true faith, receive Christ He will justify and save," already shows that this passage does not speak of an unconditional decree regarding a few persons elected from the start, but of the universal rule and ordination of God according to which the wilful despisers of His grace cannot be the elect. Paragraph 40 has the same meaning as § 66: "For it has been decided by the Father from eternity that whom He would save He would save through faith in Christ"; and as the paragraph in the Epitome: "Who, in His eternal divine counsel, determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son Christ and truly believe on Him." But that God elected unto all this from the start only a certain number, Missouri will never prove from the Confession, nor from the gospel, in which election is revealed.

The entire eight decrees show that at no point God excluded any man who does not exclude himself. God determined in the first place to redeem the entire human race. Here, then, no man is excluded. Secondly He determined to "offer, present, and distribute" this benefit through the means of grace. Missouri indeed claims that "to us" refers only to the elect, so that the decree would read: "That such merit and benefit of Christ should be offered, presented, and distributed to the elect through His Word and Sacrament." In the same way all the following decrees are perverted; they are all to refer only to the elect. "That He would be efficacious and active in us by His Holy Ghost through the Word, when it is preached, heard, and pondered," etc., is to mean: That He would be efficacious in the elect. Again: "That all those who, in true repentance,

receive Christ by true faith He would justify and receive into grace," etc., is to mean: That He would justify the elect. In such a bold and gross way Missouri perverts the Confession, and in this way it proved its election unto the call and unto faith!

The very words themselves will not admit of such a construction; as the benefits of Christ have been obtained for the human race, so according to God's purpose they are to be offered, presented, and distributed to all men in common, as also Christ immediately after His resurrection commanded: Preach the gospel to every creature.

But since no man by his own reason or strength could believe the gospel, God has made the necessary provision; He has determined to convert the hearts of men by His Holy Ghost through the Word, when it is preached, heard, and pondered. The gift of the Holy Ghost also is thus promised not merely to certain persons elected thereto, but to the Word; as also we have seen in the Epitome: "He promises besides" — in addition to the hearing of the Word, no matter who hears and considers it — "the power and efficiency of the Holy Ghost, and divine assistance for perseverance and eternal salvation." He who does not hear the Word, or when he hears it resists wilfully the operation of the Holy Ghost, remains, to be sure, without repentance and faith, and thereby excludes himself from all the following decrees of God. There are unfortunately many who do this, and so the fourth decree already makes a distinction among men: "That all those who" — not all men, but only all those who — "in true repentance receive Christ by a true faith He would justify and receive into grace, adoption, and inheritance of eternal life." If this were to mean only the elect, as Missouri pretends, it would be nonsense, for the words are "all those who receive Christ by a true faith He would justify." Missouri's interpretation would result in the nonsensical declaration, that possibly all the elect would not believe, and that God simply determined to justify those of the elect who did believe, and not the rest of the elect! The words, "all those who," show that God has determined from among a larger number to justify only a certain portion. If, as Missouri maintains firmly, these decrees speak only of the elect, there would have to be this difference among the elect, that some believe and are justified, while others do not believe and are not justified. But no! From among those who are called God justifies those who believe in

Christ, and He justifies them all, even those who afterwards fall away, temporary believers, whom Missouri also would have excluded from this decree. Nevertheless the words are clear and stand like a wall; and they agree also with the Scriptures, thank God! He that believes in Christ is justified.

It is important to note that the clear words of our Confession declare that all believers are received in the same way unto adoption and the inheritance of eternal life; and yet this does not say that temporary believers are elected, in the strictest sense of the word, unto salvation. Those only are elected who persevere to the end, and for this reason the eighth decree uses different terms: "Eternally save and glorify in eternal life." As long, however, as a person believes in Christ that long he is a child and heir of God, and therefore need not anxiously inquire whether the grace of election hover over him. There is no greater grace than this that we be children of God and heirs of salvation; all believers have this grace, yet they can lose it through fault of their own; and this does not prevent election; for even the elect fall temporarily and lose the grace they had, as the instance of David and of the Galatians proves: "Thou art the man" (of death) — "Ye are fallen from grace." Finally, the fourth decree is very important, especially in the present controversy, because it shows that according to God's eternal purpose the reception of a person "unto the adoption and inheritance of eternal life" depends on his own reception of Christ in true repentance and true faith. If only our opponents would examine this decree more closely, they might perhaps return to the truth; it annihilates their doctrine of election on all sides.

According to the fifth decree God also determined to sanctify in love all who believe and are justified, i. e. to renew them, that they may be able to war against evil lusts and escape return to the slavery of Satan. According to the sixth decree, to protect them against their enemies, to govern them graciously, to strengthen them in weakness, to comfort them in all affliction, so that they may not in despondency and impatience deny Christ. The last two blessings, however, do not as yet constitute preservation in faith itself; the seventh decree speaks of that. God would preserve in them, i. e. in all believers — Missouri declares again, in the elect — the good work, that is faith, love, patience, if they observe God's Word, etc. But they cannot do this of

their own strength, Missouri tells us. Nor is it necessary that they should; for we are speaking of people who already have the Spirit and grace of God, know and love God's Word, although they also have the flesh which constantly seeks to draw them away from the Word. Everything then depends on their abiding by the Word, on their watching and praying diligently, and thus using faithfully the gifts they have received. By this they will not preserve themselves, but only remain in the order in which God alone will keep them. Believers can do this, and when they do it, there is no doubt but what God will faithfully keep His promises and preserve them in faith. This decree has the same difficulty for our opponents as the fourth. Claiming that here again only the elect, and not all believers, are spoken of, they cannot make the words fit properly: "If they observe God's Word," etc.; for these words show that possibly God will not preserve some. If the decree speaks only of the elect, we would have the question, whether all the elect will be preserved, just as the Missourian notion produced the question, whether all the elect will be really brought to faith. It is absolutely impossible to harmonize the Missourian conception with the clear words of the Confession; our opponents have done much patching on these decrees, but all in vain. What is written is written!

The eighth decree for the first time mentions the selection of persons itself: "That those whom He has elected, called, and justified, He would eternally save and glorify in life eternal." But even here "whom He has elected" does not stand alone; for then some one might think: O, if I only knew whether I am elected; for if I am not elected, all the other decrees will be "of no avail" for me; everything depends on this last, etc. All such thoughts our Confession cuts off by adding the two words "called and justified," thus briefly summarizing and repeating the foregoing decrees. In this manner our Confession interweaves eternal election and the revealed counsel of grace in every possible way. The foregoing decrees have instructed us in regard to the "called and justified"; we have learned that from eternity God ordained everything for this purpose, so firmly and securely that even the gates of hell cannot subvert a single one of these decrees, and that God has not excluded a single person from all His gracious ordination. We can therefore be perfectly at rest, and joyfully praise and mag-

nify God. Now the Confession places beside "called and justified" the altogether synonymous word, "whom He has elected." Just as God has excluded no man in calling and justifying who does not exclude himself, he has likewise omitted no man for any but the very same reason in eternal election. And thus again we can be perfectly at rest. This is how election is revealed in the gospel, "explained" and "proclaimed." And therefore, when we hear the precious gospel concerning God's grace towards all sinners, we need seek no further whether we are really elected. There is no mystery hovering above our heads to cast a shadow upon the gospel. Christ has revealed to us the Father's will and thereby also our eternal election, when He declares: Repent ye and believe — God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, etc. "Therefore"— our Confession continues in the passage referred to —"no one who would be saved should trouble or harass himself with thoughts concerning the secret counsel of God, as to whether he is elected and ordained to eternal life; for with these miserable Satan is accustomed to attack and annoy godly hearts. But they should hear Christ, who is the Book of Life and God's eternal election of all God's children to eternal life; who testifies to all men without distinction that it is God's will that all men who labor and are heavy laden with sin should come to Him, in order that He may give them rest and save them." § 70. This language Missouri unfortunately does not understand and cannot understand it for the simple reason that it does not find election revealed in the gospel, but imagines that God selected the persons according to a secret hidden will and counsel. The very thing declared again and again by our Confession to be indispensable for the correct understanding of the doctrine of election, namely that election must be "sought" and "considered" and the true "judgment" concerning it formed from the gospel and from the gospel alone— this is the very thing our opponents reject; they hold fast to their notion, election is a mystery. And thus they are bound to arrive at a different goal; for they ascribe to their "mystery" all that the Confession ascribes to the gospel. This mystery of theirs is made the cause which procures, works, and promotes our salvation and all that belongs thereto; this mystery is declared to be the source whence everything flows; this mystery is considered the very sweetest consolation. And thus this mystery, which only embraces a few persons, is in reality exalted

to constitute a new counsel of salvation beyond Christ, beyond the grace of God, beyond the gospel, etc. Oh, it is a terrible judgment upon this proud Synod thus to err grossly without finding any decided testimony against its error from among the nearly one thousand pastors, professors, presidents, etc., within its bounds, from among all these famous guardians of the "reine Lehre." What puerile means may not these St. Louis savants use in defending their case, without arousing the least suspicion among their faithful devotees! They dare publicly to assert that these 8 decrees include only the elect, although the very first one, as all the world can see, embraces all men, and the wording of all the rest is such as to render it absolutely impossible to refer them to the elect alone. They dare assert that wherever the Confession speaks of revealing election it means personal certainty. They dare begin by fabricating a mystery, of which the Scriptures know nothing, and dare then to use this "mystery" in order to shield this very mystery against every attack; for as soon as their doctrine of election is refuted by the clear word of the gospel, they reply: It is a mystery. By means of this mystery they manage to get rid of the entire revealed Word; no passage of Scripture will avail to convince them, for all the passages printed in the Bible belong to the revealed counsel of God; and the St. Louis invention consists in the claim, that all the passages of the revealed counsel are not to fit at all into the mystery. And so they can teach concerning this mystery whatever they please; they can upset the entire gospel and say simply: It is a mystery. And the entire Synod is ready to submit!

THESIS IV.

The gospel directs us to Christ — God has elected in Christ.

(This part of the German original passed through the hands of P. Ernst before being printed in German.)

In the Gospel, as we have seen, election is revealed. But according to the Gospel all salvation is founded only upon Christ and His most holy merit. And therefore election also must have taken place in Christ, i. e. for the sake of the merit of Jesus Christ.

"Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them"; this is the judgment of a holy and righteous God upon all the transgressors of the law. The judgment of everlasting death is thus pronounced upon the whole human race. "For there is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3, 23. And God cannot proceed without anything further to cancel or take back this judgment. God's holiness, which must ever hate all wickedness, stands in the way; His righteousness likewise, which must ever reward every man according to his works; and also His truth, which must execute the punishment after it is imposed. Therefore, before the love of God could cancel the judgment of the law regarding the sinner and bestow upon him freedom from guilt and punishment, righteousness and salvation, the guilt and punishment of sin had to be removed in a way that would perfectly satisfy the divine righteousness, and a perfect fulfillment of the requirements of the law had to be rendered.

But who was to render this sufficient satisfaction? Man himself? Where was man in his unholiness and in his total depravity to find strength for rendering a perfect fulfillment of the law? What could man pay to atone for his guilt after he had fallen into eternal death? A mediator, a substitute, a bondsman had to be found for him in order to render the necessary perfect atonement for him. But who was to be this mediator? No angel was able to undertake the task. For the word of the Scriptures applies also to the angels: "None of them can by any

means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him; for the redemption of their soul is precious, and it ceaseth forever" (Ps. 49, 7-8). God Himself had to undertake the task. And—eternal thanks be to Him!—He did undertake it. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." God Himself became man in Christ, put Himself under the law in voluntary love, and became obedient unto death, yea unto the death of the cross. By this vicarious work and suffering of the incarnate Son of God the guilt and punishment of all sinners was completely canceled and a flawless fulfillment of the law obtained for all; thus the eternal righteousness of God was satisfied, the punitive judgment of the law was carried out and thereby removed, and the possibility opened for the sinner of escaping the judgment through grace. For now God can declare sinners free and admit them to salvation without interfering with His righteousness and holiness.

When God now actually declares a certain sinner free of guilt and punishment and gives him salvation, He is moved to this act not by any merit, any performance, any worthiness of man, but without any merit on man's part, entirely gratis—by His grace for the sake of the reconciliation which Jesus Christ has wrought. Because God imputed to His dear Son the sins of the sinner, as though His Son had Himself committed them, He now imputes to the sinner the holy suffering of Jesus Christ, as though the sinner had himself endured it, and on the strength of this imputation He pronounces him free from all punishment. Because God put His dear Son under the law, as though His Son was bound in duty Himself to fulfill it, He now imputes to the sinner Christ's fulfillment of the law, as though the sinner had himself rendered it, and on the strength of this imputation declares him to be just and an heir of eternal life. Not in us, therefore, but outside of ourselves, in Christ alone, namely in His most holy merit lies the cause of the justification and salvation of the sinner.

And there also lies the reason and cause of election, for election is nothing but the eternal decree of God to justify sinners in time and to save them eternally. Therefore, just as God, because of His eternal righteousness and holiness, can in time actually declare sinners free from the curse of the law and saved only for the sake of the merit of Jesus Christ; so also our holy and righteous God could determine in eternity to declare sinners

free from the curse of the law and to save them forever—or to elect—only for the sake of the merit of Jesus Christ. To be sure, reconciliation was not then effected; but just as the fall was already present before the omniscient eye of God, redemption also was present, when He appointed certain persons unto the infallible attainment of salvation. It is for this reason Christ is called the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. 13, 8), i. e. slain according to God's eternal ordination and promise. Furthermore, just as God justifies and saves in time only for the sake of the merit of Jesus Christ and not for the sake of anything in man, so also He elected unto salvation in eternity only for the sake of the merit of Jesus Christ and not for the sake of any good quality in man. And therefore the apostle declares, Eph. 1, 3-4: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ. According as He hath chosen us in Him." By the word "according" the apostle binds together the eternal election and the temporal blessings. Now we are blessed of God in time only for the sake of Christ; therefore we are also elected of God in eternity only for the sake of Christ. In Christ, therefore, the Savior ordained from eternity, lies the sole and exclusive meritorious cause of eternal election.—So teach the Scriptures, so our Church believes, teaches, and confesses, and so we believe, teach and confess with our Church.

We place no merit whatever in man by our doctrine of predestination, as Missouri dishonestly declares. Missouri could know better from our writings; for we have repeated and most emphatically testified that we do not ascribe the least merit or worthiness to man for the sake of which he could be said to have been elected. As in justification so also in election we base everything entirely upon God's mercy and Christ's merit. We declare that there are only two moving causes of election, not three, as Missouri is pleased to impute to us. We confess with our F. C.: "Through this doctrine and explanation of the eternal and saving choice of the elect children of God His own glory is entirely and fully given to God, that in Christ He saves us out of pure mercy, without any merits or good works of ours, according to the purpose of His will, as it is written, Eph. 1: Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise

of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us accepted in the Beloved. Therefore it is false and wrong when it is taught that not only the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ, but also that there is in us a cause of God's election, on account of which God has chosen us to eternal life." §§ 87-88. As the Confession in this passage, so we also, and that as emphatically as our opponents are able to do, reject the doctrine, that beyond the mercy of God and the merit of Christ Jesus there is in us also a cause for the sake of which God elected us unto eternal life. We indeed declare—and our authority will be set forth in the following thesis—that Christ's merit is here considered not merely as it has been obtained for us, but also as it is appropriated by us; that accordingly faith does not flow from election, but precedes election in the thought of God. But we by no means constitute faith a third impelling cause of election. On the contrary, we heartily confess with the third article: "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Christ or come to Him." We ascribe no free will to man, by means of which he might be able to accommodate and prepare himself for grace. We do not hold that when the Word comes to man it awakes powers slumbering in him, by means of which he then would be able to decide in favor of grace and give the word of assent. We do not picture the process to our minds as though God comes half way and we the other half, or at least a few steps. On the contrary, we know from the Scriptures, the Confession, and our own experience, as well as does Missouri, that God must come the entire way to us, and that, if God should decline to do so, we would never be united with Him. We believe and confess that God must convert man; man cannot of his own powers aid in the least, he can only submit passively, he can only permit God to bring him to faith; in fact, even this that man submits passively to the operation of God's grace, God Himself must work by His Spirit through the Word that calls. The Holy Spirit must overcome the natural resistance of man and liberate his will, which by nature is enslaved under sin. Yet this operation of the Holy Spirit is not irresistible, so that, whenever He begins to operate in a heart, His operation necessarily must attain the end, that man becomes a believer and remains a believer; on the contrary, on man's part there always remains the possibility of his wilfully resisting the operation of the Holy Spirit. He who opposes

God's grace with such wilful resistance either never comes to faith, or loses faith, and that by his own fault. But whenever a man comes to faith, it is never, not even for the very least part, his own work or merit, but altogether and exclusively the operation, the creative operation of the grace of God in the Word.

Nor is faith, in so far as it is a work of God in the heart of man, in so far as it is actually, taken by itself, something good, considered in election, as little as in justification. There as well as here, and here as well as there, faith finds a place solely and alone as the divinely appointed means of apprehension, as the God-given hand for receiving the merit of Jesus Christ. Just as in justification it is not faith as such, faith as a divinely produced condition of the heart, which moves God to declare unto us the forgiveness of sins, but altogether and only the merit of Jesus Christ, which forms the contents of faith; so also in election it is not faith as such, faith as a divinely wrought condition and quality of the heart, but altogether and only the merit of Jesus Christ, which moved God to appoint men unto salvation.—Where then remains any human merit upon which we could be said to make election depend? Not the least particle is left. We take faith exclusively as the work of divine grace, not as a human achievement, as the divinely appointed means for receiving the merit of Christ, not as a cause which in itself impels God. Christ's most holy merit is for us the only foundation and cause of election.

Nevertheless, Dr. Walther finds it possible to accuse us in lengthy articles of holding a "synergistic and Pelagian" doctrine of election. He has the effrontery to assert that we teach "a co-operation of man toward justification and salvation." This thought, he writes, permeates our entire doctrine of predestination. On this thought all our teaching and contention is based. This thought always forms our starting point, and this thought is ever our final goal. Synergism is the element we move in. We are synergists by birth and blood, and this synergism of ours has only broken out like a secret ulcer in the doctrine of predestination ("L. u. W.", 27, p. 414). We attack the truth of the Gospel, "justification by faith alone," make faith the work of man for the sake of which he is justified, etc. (pp. 415 and 416). Indeed, not merely synergists does he declare us to be, but "Pelagians of the grossest kind" ("Illumination," p. 59) "who continue to dally with reason like Jews and Turks" (p. 29).

What is Dr. W.'s authority for raising such strong accusations against us? He introduces as proofs for his assertions a selection of synergistic and Pelagian propositions, which he pretends to have found in our writings, and which he imagines prove without question that we move in synergism as the fish does in water. The first flower of this kind which he introduces, very fragrant according to his notion, and clearly betraying the synergistic tree whence it was plucked, is one of the theses furnished at the request of St. Louis by Prof. Schmidt; it reads: "It is of the highest importance for the scriptural elucidation of the doctrine of predestination to note carefully the distinction between the universal and the particular will of God's grace, since the latter, as the immediate reason and norm of election in the strictest sense of the word, does indeed presuppose the varying conduct of man toward universal grace."—Another blossom, which according to Dr. W.'s notion can grow only on synergistic ground, he finds in Prof Stellhorn's tract, p. 20: "By this we see how according to the F. C. a selection among men came to be made; God indeed would lead all men without exception into heaven on the universal way of salvation, but He would do this only when they permit Him by His grace and power to lead them on this way and do not prevent this by wilful resistance. But since the majority of men unfortunately do prevent Him from thus leading them, God could not appoint all infallibly unto salvation, but was compelled to make a selection. He thus elected all those, yet only those, who hear and consider His Word (point 3 of the F. C.), by true repentance through true faith receive Christ (point 4), hold to God's Word, pray diligently, remain in the goodness of God, and faithfully use the gifts received (point 7). All these, yet only these, are the elect, whom He also resolved to save infallibly in eternal life and to glorify (point 8)."

These and similar utterances are to prove irrefutably according to Dr. W. that we injure the "by grace alone", that we are synergists, and even Arch-Pelagians. Now it is indeed true, we have indeed taught and do still teach that in the counsel of election the consideration of the varying conduct of men towards the proffered divine grace dare not be wholly excluded. We teach: God indeed desires to lead all men to heaven on the universal way of salvation, yet only when they permit Him to lead them by His grace and power, and when they do not pre-

vent this leading by wilful resistance. We teach that a distinction must be made between the natural resistance, which does not prevent the work of the Holy Ghost, and the wilful resistance, which forecloses the way for the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in man. We indeed so teach, it is true. But it is not true that these statements are irrefragable proofs for the accusation, that we assail the 'alone by faith", or that we cherish synergism. If these statements were really what Dr. W. declares them to be—irrefragable proofs of synergism—they would at all times and everywhere necessarily contain a synergistic meaning, and could not be employed in any other sense, at least on the part of those who know what they are saying. All, who had ever employed such language, or employ it now, would then necessarily be synergists and Pelagians. Even the adage, so often repeated by Missouri in the present controversy: "If two say the same thing, it is not the same", would not alter this fact. For the claim is that these statements are undeniable proofs; therefore even this old adage will not dare enter a denial.—But how, if we could show that such statements are made not only by the dogmaticians, but even by Luther, in the Confession, and in the Scriptures themselves? Certainly, there would be only a twofold possibility: either the statements referred to are in reality undeniable proofs; and then not only we, but Luther, the Confession, and the Scriptures stand condemned: or Luther, the Confession, and the Scriptures are free of synergistic leaven in spite of these statements; and then the undeniable proofs of our synergism vanish, and the accusations raised against us are wholly false and without foundation—a grave sin against God.

There is no doubt whatever that Luther, the Confession ,and the Scriptures themselves employ these "synergistic and Pelagian" statements and expressions, for which Dr. W. accuses us, and let it be well noted, employ them in precisely the same sense as we do. As we do, so Luther also speaks of a varying conduct toward the gospel. The passage we refer to is found in his House-Postille in the sermon on the gospel for the Sunday Septugesima. There Luther preaches as follows: —

"Some seek other thoughts and interpret the words thus: Many are called, that is, God offers His grace to many; but few are chosen, that is, He bestows such grace upon few; for only few are saved. This is indeed a wicked interpretation; for how

can it be otherwise, if one really thinks and believes this of God, than that he should hate God for this reason, the fault lying in His will that we are not all saved?"

"Therefore the sense of this passage is altogether different: Many are called etc., for the preaching of the gospel proceeds in common and in public to whomever will hear and receive; and God has ordered this preaching so exceedingly in common and in public that every one may hear it, believe and accept, and be saved. But how does it turn out? As the gospel shows: Few are chosen, that is, few conduct themselves toward the gospel so that God has pleasure in them. For some hear it and do not esteem it; some hear it and do not hold fast to it, nor are willing to sacrifice anything for it, or to suffer; some hear it, yet pay more attention to money and property and worldly pleasure. But this does not please God, and He does not like such people."

"This is what Christ calls: not chosen, that is, not to conduct themselves so that God has pleasure in them. But those are chosen people and well-pleasing to God, who hear the gospel diligently, believe in Christ, prove their faith by good fruits, and suffer on account of it what they are given to suffer" (Erlangen ed., I., p. 206).

Here Luther evidently declares: Whether God has such pleasure in one who is called as to receive him into the number of His elect children, depends indeed on his so conducting himself that God can have pleasure in him. But now God can have no pleasure in the sinner apart from Christ, but only in Christ, the Son in whom He is well-pleased. But a person can be in Christ only through faith. For "without faith it is impossible to please God." To be sure, faith is not man's own work, but the gift of God. But God will give faith only to those, and does in reality give it only to those, who do not make this giving impossible by wilful resistance. In those who do this, who so conduct themselves toward the gospel, God cannot have His work, in them therefore He cannot have pleasure. — Luther thus uses the same expression as we do, uses it in the same sense as we do. Luther, therefore, must also be called a gross Pelagian, an imitator of Jews and Turks! — Well, with him as our companion we can afford to bear these heretical appellatives!

As Luther, so also the Confession speaks of the different conduct of men towards the means of grace. Thus, for instance, we read in the second article of the F. C.: "For this reason we will

now relate still further from God's Word how man is converted to God, how and through what means (namely, through the oral Word and the holy Sacraments) the Holy Ghost is efficacious in us, and is willing to work and bestow, in our hearts, true repentance, faith, and new spiritual powers and ability for good, and how we should act ourselves towards these means, and use them." (Jacobs' Translation, p. 561, § 48). The Confession sets out to show how man is converted to God; and here it states explicitly that regard must indeed be had to the manner in which man acts or conducts himself towards the appointed means of salvation. God, we are told further, indeed desires most earnestly the salvation of all men; hence He offers them all His grace in the Word efficaciously, and by means of the Word He would call men unto salvation, draw them to Himself, convert them, regenerate, and sanctify them. (§ 50). Now although man in his spiritual death cannot of his own strength receive, understand, or believe the Word, yet, even though unconverted to God, he can hear and read it outwardly. For in these outward things man has retained his free will to some extent after the fall, so that he can go to church, hear the preaching, or refuse to do so. (§ 53). And by means of this Word God works and breaks our hearts and draws man to believe the Word and give assent to it. For we are to be certain that, when God's Word is preached in truth and purity, and when men hear it with seriousness and diligence and consider it, God will surely be present and will give through the Word what man by his own powers can neither take nor give. (§§ 54, 55) When now a man refuses to hear preaching or to read the Word, and despises the Word, he has no injustice done him when the Holy Ghost does not enlighten him, but leaves him to perish in the darkness of his unbelief. (§ 58) And such a person cannot console himself with God's eternal election, nor obtain His mercy. For God does not force man to become godly. And those who always resist the Holy Ghost and persistently oppose the known truth, as Stephen says of the hardened Jews (Acts 7), will not be converted (§ 60) and cannot be converted. (§ 83) Our Confession, therefore, speaks explicitly of the varying conduct of man towards the means of grace, and in such a way as to show that it would have this "conduct" taken into consideration when the question is asked, who will and who will not be converted. — Do you think the Confession has likewise a "synergistic and Pelagian doctrine of predestination"? There is

no question, when Mo. brands us as synergistic heretics on account of the term "conduct", it condemns the Confession itself. For we use the term in the very same sense.

As far as the expression "permit one's self to be converted" is concerned which is also adduced to prove that we move in synergism as in our proper element, the Scriptures themselves contain it. When on the first day of Pentecost the preaching of Peter pierced the hearts of many, so that they inquired of the apostles: "Men and brethern, what shall we do?" Peter answered them, Acts 2, 40: "Save yourselves (according to the German text, Permit yourselves to be saved) from this untoward generation." And the apostle Paul writes, 2 Cor. 5, 19. 20: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye (i. e. permit yourselves to be, let yourselves be) reconciled to God." The apostles, therefore, have no scruples about saying "permit yourself to be helped", "permit yourself to be reconciled." And it certainly is plain that we cannot here apply the principle, "Ought to do does not argue ability to do." For the apostle does not preach law, but gospel. His words contain no demand of the law, but a gospel petition, a gospel invitation. And what the gospel demands it gives. It does not demand what it does not in the very demand give. Man indeed by nature resists the "word of reconciliation", and hence cannot of his own powers and abilities permit himself to be reconciled. But the Word itself overcomes his resistance. At the moment in which the tidings of reconciliation strike his ear he can permit himself to be reconciled, he can become a personal partaker of the reconciliation obtained for him and offered to him, if only he cast not this proffered reconcliation away by wilful resistance. And that he may not do this and thus lose his salvation, the apostle begs: "Be ye (let or permit yourself to be) reconciled to God." — Thus when the Scriptures speak of permitting oneself to be reconciled, of permitting oneself to be helped and saved, they mean precisely what we mean when we say "permit oneself to be converted." How now? Are the Scriptures become "synergistic and Pelagian"? — O this zeal without reason, this blind fanaticism of Mo.!

But especially if Dr. W. would not employ devious weight and measure, which, as is well known, the gentleman abhors, he

would have to accuse all the fathers of our Church after the time of the F. C., no less than he does us, of "synergistic and Pelagian predestination." For the doctrine we teach is identical with that taught by all the fathers of our Church after the time of the F. C. Even the astounding art of Dr. W. has not been able to this day to show the contrary, and will not be able to show it in all eternity. If there is any difference at all between the old theologians and ourselves, it is only this that they were far freer in the expressions they used, far less anxious about any possible misinterpretation of their words than we are. If then we are really synergists and Pelagians, our old fathers are such even more than we are. This will at once appear to very unprejudiced person, when we quote a few of the utterances of the fathers.

The old theologian Baier (died 1695 as professor in Halle), whose system of Christian doctrine is used as the basis for dogmatical instruction in St. Louis, is the first whom we here introduce. After reminding us, in the section on conversion, that we must distinguish between natural and wilful resistance, he goes on as follows: "This natural resistance is gradually decreased in conversion itself through the grace which dwells in the Word (per gratiam verbo Dei conjunctum) and is finally overcome, and therefore taken by itself does not prevent conversion. But the other, the wilful resistance, which is superadded to the natural, as it is not in the same way common to all the regenerate, so also men can by the powers of free will refrain from it." (Baier, Compendium, p. 439.)

On the same subject we have an expression from the renowned theologian John Huelsemann (in 1629 professor at Wittenberg; died 1661 as professor at Leipzig) in his work: De Auxiliis Gratia: "Every unregenerate man by nature despises the preaching of the cross, because it does not agree with his reason. For 'the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them', 1 Cor. 2, 14; Rom. 8, 7. On account of this natural resistance God withdraws the preaching of the gospel from no nation or individual, for it is the intention of God that the Gospel shall remove this natural resistance, and make of those who are unwilling such as are willing. Hence natural resistance is the very thing with which the grace of God is concerned, that it may be transformed and brought under the obedience of faith, 2 Cor. 5, 20; 10, 5; Luke 1, 18; Tit. 3, 3; etc. But obstinate contempt

or wilful resistance is what is described as contemptuously refusing the spiritual powers which God truly and actually imparts through every ordinary preaching of His Word, namely in so far as God extends this gift to man and thereby gives everything which on the part of God is necessary to remove the natural resistance, whether man now accepts the gift or not."

"This contempt and this (wilful) resistance is superadded to the natural and does not come into existence until the Word has become known. . . . . This wilful resistance, however, deserves that the Word of God be taken away, whether man is already actually converted or not; and this because the manifestation of this contempt could have been overcome by the grace which the preached Word at all times and everywhere bestows upon every intelligent and attentive hearer. For this first grace of God prepares its own way in man so that he can permit its operation, and requires no other grace to precede it. . . . It is the nature of the Word always to work something, and first of all the ability in man so that he will be in a condition to be able to refrain from resisting the activity of the Holy Ghost, who seeks to induce him to assent." (Page 14 etc.).

Furthermore, p. 274: "No man does anything, or co-operates in any way, towards receiving the first grace. But that he does not resist the grace which properly and according to its nature works conversion, is due to the impartation of the first grace, which is imparted to all, so that they can refrain from resistance. God has resolved to convert those actually who do not wilfully resist the operation of divine grace; and they can refrain from this resistance by virtue of the grace which is imparted to all hearers of the Word."

Quenstedt speaks in the same way; he was one of the acutest of the orthodox theologians of our Church (died 1688 as professor at Wittenberg). He speaks of conversion as follows: "This grace (prevenient grace) can be prevented, and, even though at first admitted, again rejected although no man can escape the first knocking of grace, he nevertheless, after having experienced the first motions caused by prevenient grace, can wilfully reject this grace, Matt. 23, 37; Luke 7, 20. This rejection is not caused by every resistance; not by the original or inborn, the very purpose of prevenient grace being to overcome this; nor by every inward resistance stirring actually in the heart; nor by every resistance actually manifesting itself outwardly, which the Holy Ghost meets

in the person who is to be converted — but it is caused by the actual pertinacious resistance opposed especially to the means of grace." (Theol. Didac. Polem. III., edition 1696, p. 495.)

In the following thesis he states that that prevenient grace hinders and bridles the inborn, as well as the real simple and conquerable resistance of unregenerate man; and then he continues: "We say emphatically, the actual simple and conquerable resistance. For we do not here mean that resistance, which on account of wilful wickedness is insuperable and obdurate, and which takes place when man obstinately denies and rejects what has been clearly shown from the Scriptures; which insuperable and wicked resistance God punishes by the denial of richer grace."

In answer to the objection: "If grace is resistible then the most important work necessary for our salvation, namely repentance and faith, will be placed in man's free will as the immediate cause" — Quenstedt replies: "Faith and repentance is not thereby placed in the power of free will, but resistance and non-resistance; and the distinction is as great as that between illuminating a room and presenting no obstacles to the illumination to be furnished." (III., p. 514.)

In the article of predestination Quenstedt writes: "We must distinguish between any relation whatever of faith to election, whatever it may be — as also the effect can be placed in relation to its causes, and the accident to its subject — and between an essential relation. Not the former, but the latter is here spoken of. For faith, or rather the foreseen non-rejection of the faith which prevenient grace offers, is the essential condition of the subject for election." (III, p. 30.)

As an explanation of the passage, Acts 13, 48: "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed," Quenstedt writes: "The Calvinists wrongly seek to prove by these words that foreseen constant faith does not belong to the counsel of election, since it is only the effect or result of election. For the word tassein is never used in the Scriptures of eternal election; and the word taxis does not signify an absolute decree, but a divine order which must be followed in time; wherefore also the tetagmenoi are not those predestinated (Verordnete), but those ordered (Geordnete), who keep themselves in and under the divine order. Those who keep the divinely prescribed order, enter into it, follow it, as Franz interprets. They are described in this passage as the opposite of verse 46. These are the tetagmenoi (in the

order), those are the atactoi (out of the order, disorderly). But these latter were not people simply rejected in eternity, but rejected as (in time) disturbing the taxis, the divinely instituted order, as treading it under foot, as rejecting God's Word, etc. Here, therefore, we treat of the taxis, which refers to the order in time offered by the preaching of the gospel, and does not refer to eternal election. The meaning of the words, therefore, is: Only those come to believe who submitted themselves to the divine order, permitted themselves to be drawn, rejected not the Word of grace, but received it with joy. . . . Ægidius Hunnius gives the excellent paraphrase: "There came to believe and receive the gift of faith as many as followed the order which God had appointed in His counsel for the attaining of eternal life." (Ed. 1696, III., p. 42.)

We do not introduce these testimonies, which might be multiplied indefinitely, in order to establish our doctrine of predestination on the authority of the "fathers." We know that proof for our doctrine must be brought solely from the Word of God. We only desire to show in these testimonies that the old fathers did indeed and even in greater measure than we ourselves emphasize a varying conduct towards the means of grace, a permitting oneself to be converted through the power and operation of the Holy Ghost, a distinction between natural and wilful resistance. Our opinion is not that certain phrases and expressions are established as unassailable simply for the reason that the "fathers" employed them. But this is what we claim, if our doctrine of predestination is necessarily one that injures and upsets the "by grace alone" because it contains these expressions, then the very same thing applies also to the doctrine of predestination taught by the fathers. For they have repeatedly used the same terms, and in the same sense as we use them; they emphasized them over against the Calvinists at least as much as we emphasize them over against the Calvinism of Missouri; and they have not rejected all human merit, all co-operation of man for his conversion, more strongly than we now reject it. If then our doctrine of predestination must be branded as synergistic and Pelagian in the opinion of some, these people ought to have at least so much sense of justice and honesty as to give the same appellation to the same thing in others, also in our Lutheran dogmaticians. They should have the courage to say frankly and freely what they have said indirectly and by implica-

tion in condemning our doctrine, namely that our Lutheran fathers have for 300 years injured the "by faith alone" by their doctrine of predestination. Something of this kind "L. u. W." has finally undertaken. P. Stöckhardt writes in the last issue: "They (the dogmaticians) desire to some extent at least to explain and render plausible to reason this wonderful mystery of the discretio personarum (the selection of persons). And in this they have erred and have deviated from the Scriptures and the Symbol." (April 1882, p. 158.) Frankly and freely Pastor Stöckhardt here accuses theologians of the time subsequent to the F. C. of deviating from the Scriptures and the Confession in regard to the doctrine of predestination. It is certainly a terrible slander, which is thus thrown upon Lutheran theologians, yea upon the entire Lutheran Church after the F. C., in the assertion that this Church, immediately after setting up its Confession, deviated from it, and that the prominent theologians of this Church were in reality already rationalist. Poor Lutheran Church! You have all this time falsely called yourself the "orthodox church"! This glory was nothing but an empty dream, till now at last the light of a new reformation has dawned in St. Louis. — But however lamentable the fact, that men who claim to be Lutheran theologians heap such shame upon their own Church, it is nevertheless at least an open and honest declaration which has thus been made, and therefore a hundred times preferable to the deceptive arts hitherto practiced for so long a time by "L. u. W." Now all may know indeed what is the position of St. Louis in regard to the dogmaticians. But how do our opponents proceed now? They attempt to tell the world that our doctrine of predestination and that of the dogmaticians are two totally different things. In the heat of combat our old dogmaticians, they say, did indeed here and there utter an ambiguous and inconvenient expression; but that was all. Essentially their doctrine is in perfect accord with that of Missouri. And Missouri does not think of assailing or of even rejecting the doctrine of the dogmaticians. Only an expression here and there Missouri does not like to appropriate. Their war is not against the doctrine of these faithful witnesses, but altogether against our doctrine. The dogmaticians have nothing in common with our doctrine. We may continue to say that we ascribe to man not the least merit of his own, not the least power for conversion — all that is mere wind. We are nothing

but synergists and Pelagians; have always been such in reality; never taught correctly concerning justification; make faith in the good old papistic way a work of man, for the sake of which he is justified. And this secret ulcer has now finally broken out in the doctrine of predestination. We are now revealed as people who have attacked the very heart of the Lutheran Church. This appears undeniably from the expressions we employ in explaining the doctrine of election. The dogmaticians indeed used the same expressions; but their use of them does not mark a synergistic and Pelagian doctrine of predestination, for they only employed these expressions in opposition to the Calvinists, while we employ them in opposition to Missouri. If we were not synergists, we would not assail the orthodox (?) Missouri Synod.

Is this not indeed devious weight and measure? — But there remains only one either — or. Either these expressions are in reality undeniable proofs of synergism. And then all who use them are synergists and Pelagians, the dogmaticians no less than we. And if Dr. W. really wants to be zealous for the "truth of the gospel," he must fight against the predestination doctrine of the dogmaticians and reject it as fiercely as he fights against and rejects ours. — Or these expressions in themselves prove nothing in regard to "synergistic and Pelagian doctrine of predestination." Then they prove nothing in regard to ourselves. Then Dr. W: must proceed to bring other, really undeniable proofs, before he will be able to accuse justly. And as long as he has not furnished these proofs, we declare his accusation to be a grave wrong, a gross calumniation, a calumniation equal to the explicit slander of our old dogmaticians as synergists.

When one of the "opponents" of Missouri would not promise unconditionally at the Chicago Conference, not to assail publicly in the future the doctrine of Missouri, which according to that "opponent's" conviction was false, Dr. W. uttered the threat, that, if new attacks should provoke him to fight, his opponents would be astonished at the language he would be compelled to use in publicly characterizing his enemies. And he has kept his word. He has not hesitated to brand his opponents as synergists and Arch-Pelagians on account of expressions and terms which the Scriptures themselves, the Confession, Luther, and the dogmaticians employ. Certainly this is astonishing. And especially when we recall that he himself has taught and to this day has

not retracted, the very same doctrine which he now attacks as heretical. To prove this we will quote only a single passage from the synodical Report of the Northern District for the year 1873. This Report contains a discussion of the doctrine of conversion on the basis of theses furnished by Dr. W. The doctrine is not discussed merely in passing, but the purpose of the whole discussion was a thorough treatment of this doctrine especially. According to the introduction those points in particular are to be treated in which we meet various errors. If anywhere, this is where Missouri has expressed itself on the doctrine of conversion. We are, therefore, certainly justified in considering everything we find here as the doctrine of Dr. W., as also of the Missouri Synod itself. And what expressions do we find? After the above passage from Quenstedt regarding different kinds of resistance is quoted, we read on page 49: "Divine grace can be divided according to its manifestations into three degrees: 1) prevenient grace, that is the operation of the Holy Spirit which must precede when God converts a person in the ordinary way; 2) efficient grace, by which God produces faith; and 3) co-operative grace, which co-operates with the strength already dwelling in regenerate man. As man is by nature he can do nothing but resist the operations of the Holy Spirit; wilful resistance he can, not indeed absolutely, but to some extent, refrain from by his own power. But we must remember that our fathers understood by wilful resistance wicked, obstinate resistance. This obstinate resistance man can refrain from by his own power when grace comes to him, but not the resistance in his will and purpose (willige, vorsätzliche) which is found in every soul, even in true Christians." According to Quenstedt a threefold distinction is here made in regard to resistance: the inborn; the simple, actual; and the wilful, obstinate. The inborn and the actual are found in all men, at least in all adults, even still in true Christians. This the Holy Spirit alone can overcome; it, however, does not prevent the work of the Holy Spirit. His work is prevented only by the wilful resistance. But this wilful resistance man can, although not absolutely, yet to some extent, refrain from by his own strength. Here evidently the omission of wilful resistance is placed in the category of civil righteousness (justitia civilis) concerning which the Augsburg Confession declares that man "hath some liberty to work" this. He indeed has this strength only to some extent; hence

grace must certainly be added; but when grace has been added then man can refrain from wilful resistance, and that of his own strength. This is what Missouri teaches in so many words. And let us again recall, this is not in passing, not merely once in some sermon, but in a synodical Report which sets out to elucidate thoroughly the doctrine of conversion particularly in those points which are liable to error. — Should it seem possible then for Dr. W. to accuse us as synergists and Pelagians on account of a doctrine which he himself has confessed, and that in the strongest of terms, a doctrine which, since Missouri claims not to have deviated from its former teachings, is even now yet that of the Missouri Synod! — Who does not recall the word of the apostle: "Wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things," Rom. 2, 1. When Missouri condemns our doctrine as synergism, it pronounces judgment upon itself.

But the claim is that we declare faith to be the cause which impels or moves God in election. This is Dr. W.'s claim — things are very easily claimed — and he appeals to an essay in "Altes und Neues," II., p. 7. But his claim is false. Never did "A. u. N." form the proposition: "Faith is the cause which impels God in election." "Who says this lies" — this noble expression would be the answer of Dr. W. in such a case. The passage in "A. u. N." referred to is as follows: "Dr. W. certainly knows the fathers as scarcely another man does. Why then does he try to make us believe that our orthodox fathers absolutely rejected the expression, 'faith is the cause moving God in election'?" — These words, according to Dr. W., contain a question so silly that only one who knows nothing at all about the history of dogma could have asked it, but at the same time reveals as clearly as possible our synergistic Pelagianism. Now these are indeed two bold, yet altogether untrue statements. The question asked is far from being foolish, for it is a fact, that a large number of orthodox theologians, instead of rejecting this expression, themselves actually used it: Musæus, Baier, Scherzer, Bechmann, and others. And even those who did not care to use the expression themselves did not absolutely reject it. In its Pelagian construction, when faith is taken as man's own free deed, all the dogmaticians, as the article in "A. u. N." explicitly notes, rejected it; but not in every construction, not absolutely. These are facts which only a person altogether

ignorant of the history of dogma will undertake to deny. — But what shall we say, when Dr. W. who knows the facts as well as any one can know them speaks as though the very contrary were true? And besides, it is not at all absolutely false to call faith the cause moving God in election. It would certainly be false — and "A. u. N." is careful to say so — to consider faith as man's own work, or even as a divinely wrought quality and condition of man, and then to ascribe to this faith causative or motive power. But in so far as faith embraces Jesus Christ and possesses Christ it can indeed, for the sake of Christ, i. e. of His merit which it embraces, be termed the cause moving God, as in justification, so also in election. To be sure, it is not faith itself, but the merit of Jesus Christ embraced by faith, which moves God. But since faith is, as it were, the vessel containing this treasure, I have a perfect right to call faith, because of the treasure it contains, the impelling cause. This is frequently done by the Scriptures themselves. Thus, for instance, Paul writes, Rom. 4, 5: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Rom. 5, 1: "Therefore, being justified by faith." According to the original text the words read "out of faith." Faith is thus called the source whence justification flows. And in Gal. 2, 16, Paul writes: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law." According to the original text the words read: "be justified out of faith and not out of works"! So then justification flows from faith. — If the apostle Paul did not happen to be Paul, Missouri would proceed to manufacture this expression into a proof of his synergistic and Pelagian doctrine of predestination. — How often, moreover, do we find Luther saying: for the sake of faith, on account of faith — thereby following Paul in calling faith a cause moving God; to be sure, not for its own sake, but for the sake of the merit of Christ which it apprehends. Rightly therefore the old theologian Bechmann writes: "Faith may be considered in respect to its object, namely the merit of Christ which it apprehends; when so considered it has the power to move God; and thus faith is a cause of election, in so far as, foreseen of God in eternity, it moved God through the power of Christ's merit to elect some." (Theol. Polem. p. 704.)

Therefore, even if we had declared faith to be the cause moving God in election, this would be no proof of synergism; this would not by any means put us into the footsteps of Pelagians, Jews, and Turks, but only in the footsteps of the dogmaticians, of Luther, and of Paul, who have no scruples whatever about describing faith as a cause moving God. But we have not even done this much, we have never used this expression in stating or establishing our doctrine of election. And Missouri know this well. Notwithstanding, they attempt by all means to twist this phrase into a proof of our synergistic and Pelagian teaching.—It is not difficult to find the reason for this deceptive and dishonest procedure. We have raised the accusation, grave indeed, yet only too true, against them of attempting to introduce an altogether unbiblical and un-Lutheran, essentially Calvinistic doctrine of election. We have demonstrated the truth of our accusation in an altogether incontestable way. Consequently, they are in a difficulty. They will not retract. They are bound to be in the right. Hence, with customary dexterity they seek to snatch the sword from their opponent's hand and to wield it against the opponent himself; the Calvinistic cloven hoof is tucked away as carefully as possible, and the matter is made to appear as though the Missourian doctrine of election consisted simply in ascribing man's conversion, justification, preservation, and final salvation altogether to the free grace of God. Thus the claim is supported, that when we opponents fight against the Missourian doctrine of election, we are fighting in reality against the "by grace alone", and showing ourselves to be miserable synergists. In this way Missouri hopes to annihilate the hated "opponents" and to rescue its orthodox fame. And to give some color at least to their purpose, they drag all possible and impossible things together, substitute what they need where it is wanting, omit what does not suit them—and then cry out: "Consequently there is no doubt whatever but what our opponents cherish a synergistic and Pelagian doctrine of predestination."—It is the very same dishonest game played of old by the Calvinists against our fathers. They too set up the claim that in their doctrine of election everything was ascribed to the free grace of God. But when our fathers rejected their unconditional election, they again and again raised the cry that our fathers were injuring the "by grace alone." Our fathers might show ever so clearly that

the point at issue between them and the Calvinists was not whether everything was free grace or not, but whether God had appointed according to the free, unconditional purpose of His secret will a few among men in preference to the rest unto faith and unto salvation; they might disclaim and guard themselves ever so decidedly against all synergism and Pelagianism—it was all of no avail; the Calvinists simply continued to hurl the accusation against our fathers: You are robbing God's free grace of its honor! Missouri to-day proceeds in precisely the same way. We may show ever so incontestably that the point at issue between us is not whether a man receives his entire salvation from grace alone or not, but whether God according to the mere pleasure of His will appointed some unto faith and unto salvation, while He did not so appoint others; we may continue with our fathers to call the mercy of God and the merit of Jesus Christ the only causes moving God in election; we may deny ever so emphatically all co-operation of man in the work of conversion, and thus also all merit of man, and ascribe it to grace alone—it is all of no avail. Since we reject the Missourian election according to "mere good pleasure" as a Calvinistic error, we must be synergists and Pelagians who attack the article of justification by grace alone.—But if they will, let them repeat their accusation as often and as long as they please—it strikes us as little as did the accusation of the Calvinists our fathers. In unison with our fathers we will hold fast immovably: "Not of works, but by grace alone, for the sake of Christ." But in unison with our fathers we will also hold fast: By faith alone, that it may be by grace.

THESIS V.

God has elected in view of faith.

Election, as we have seen, is revealed in the Gospel. The Gospel, however, points us, as we have seen furthermore, to the merit of Christ as the only and exclusive cause of all salvation, therefore also of the election to eternal life. God has not appointed men to salvation on account of their own works, their own merit, their own worthiness, but solely for the sake of the merit of Jesus Christ. The ground and the cause of election do not, even in the smallest measure, lie in us, but alone in Christ and the mercy of God. As however God's mercy, so also the merit of Christ, considered in itself, is altogether universal. Christ is the propitiation not only for the sins of the elect, but also for the sins of the whole world. In Him the justification of life has come upon all. In Christ's merit, therefore, considered merely from the standpoint of its acquisition, there can be grounded no choice from among sinners, since it has been acquired for all alike. If Christ's merit with regard to its acquisition alone had decided election, then all sinners would have been elected. But now all sinners are not elected; God has really made a selection, He has appointed some in preference to others unto salvation. Accordingly the merit of Christ must have been considered also with respect to its appropriation, which takes place through faith. The merit of Christ apprehended by faith must have decided who among redeemed sinners was to be saved and who was not. When God in eternity finally separated those who alone shall be saved from those who are not saved, He must have sought this appropriation of the merit of Christ by faith. What the Apology says: "Faith makes the difference between those who are saved and those who are damned" — held good also with regard to eternal election. Foreseen faith, or the merit of Jesus Christ apprehended in faith and foreknown by God, made the difference between those that were elected and those that were not elected. In short: Election took place in view of faith. And that is what our fifth thesis teaches.

With this thesis we have now come to the real point on which the present doctrinal controversy turns. This doctrine, namely, that God has elected in view of faith, Missouri has rejected and condemned as false, and has set up on the other hand a doctrine that, in its innermost essence is nothing but simple Calvinism. Missouri maintains that faith dare in no sense be conceived as a cause of election, not even as a secondary cause, not as a condition, in general not as a presupposition; that the Holy Scriptures know nothing of the foresight of faith as a presupposition of election; that the doctrine, that God first foresaw faith and thereupon appointed just those unto salvation whom He foresaw as believers, is contrary to Scripture. Missouri holds that faith, on the contrary, is dependent on the choice of persons, that it is an object and a goal and a result of election; that God has chosen the elect unto the call to faith and unto perseverance in faith; that election is the fountain whence all this flows; that God has not acted according to the rule of the revealed counsel of grace: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved", but according to a hidden rule of His secret will; that the merit of Jesus Christ apprehended in faith has not decided what sinner shall be saved in preference to others, but alone the free pleasure of the divine will. — The point of controversy between us and Missouri is not this: Is man's whole salvation due only to the grace of God, or in part also to himself? It is true that Missourians try to present the question in this form, and then proceed to assert that they ascribe everything to the grace of God, whilst we want man too credited with a part in his salvation. But this is false pretence. We are agreed with Missouri that all is of grace. That is not the question at all in the present controversy. The point of dispute between us and Missouri is this: How did it come that of sinners, all alike lost in Adam, and all alike redeemed in Christ, a certain number was chosen in preference to others and appointed unto the certain attainment of salvation? Was this determined by the merit of Christ as apprehended by faith, or — by the free pleasure of a secret will of God? This, this is the point of controversy — and this alone. Missouri together with the Calvinists affirms the latter, we together with the orthodox teachers of our Church the former. — The question therefore in the present conflict is by no means about trifles, about unessential subordinate points of Christian doctrine, about theological subtleties. We are concerned about a matter as important as any that

ever engaged the attention of the American-Lutheran Church in the conflicts she has waged. The question refers to nothing less than the principal and fundamental doctrines of the whole Gospel, that the salvation of a sinner depends wholly upon the merit of Jesus Christ apprehended by faith, and upon nothing else, whether human works or a secret will of God. We are concerned about the truth of the universal gracious will revealed in the Gospel. This universal gracious will of God is undermined and overthrown by the Missouri doctrine of an election unto faith in accordance with the mere divine pleasure, even though this will be not expressly denied. And because we would hold fast to this universal gracious plan revealed in the Gospel, we reject the Neo-Missourian doctrine of a choice unto salvation according to the mere pleasure of God, and confess with our fathers: God has elected in view of faith.

The fact, that we with our fathers confess this doctrine, does not prove it to be a true doctrine, just as little as its condemnation by Missouri makes it a false doctrine. Everything depends here upon proving the truth of the doctrine from the Word of God. Such proof we shall now furnish, and we shall first consider those passages that treat expressely of election. From these passages it will be proved incontestibly that God, according to the Scripture, has not elected unto faith but in view of faith.

The first passage to be considered is Matt. 22, 1-14. In the parable of a marriage supper Christ pictures to us the kingdom of Heaven. The king has prepared the feast and sent out the servants to call the guests to the marriage. It is his earnest will that all the guests, none excepted, should participate in the marriage feast. But this royal purpose is not realized, for the guests will not come. He indeed sends out again other servants; but those invited despise these also, yes, some even scoff at them and slay them. Then the king, in his anger, punishes these guests, destroys the murderers and burns their city. In order, however, that there may be guests at the marriage table, he sends his servants out upon the highways, to invite to the wedding whomsoever they shall find. A great number accepts the invitation, the tables are all furnished with guests. But not all those that have come share in the feast. There is one who has appeared without a wedding garment. Him the king causes to be cast out. And then Christ closes the parable with the words: "Many are called, but few are chosen."

This parable evidently treats of eternal election. Missouri indeed will not admit it. According to her the mere fact and nothing beyond the fact that few are chosen is here expressed. From the parable itself, she says, no proof as regards the doctrine dare be taken. But that is not true. When our Lord Himself declares the purpose of the parable, as He does here, there certainly can be drawn from the parable a proof for the doctrine. As the parable of the sower means to state more than the simple fact, that few are saved by the preaching of the Word, showing also how it comes that the majority hear it unto damnation and only a few unto salvation; so this parable also declares not only the fact that few are chosen, but at the same time, why it is that of the many called only few are chosen. — Our Confessions also use this parable as a proof-passage for the doctrine of election. The Confessions find here a proof not only for the fact, that the number of the elect as compared with the called is small, but also for the statement, that in the doctrine of election all the eternal decrees of God "respecting our redemption, calling, justification and salvation" are summed up together. According to our Confessions the whole eternal decree of salvation in its various parts is summed up in this parable, and at the same time the explanation is given how it comes that only few are chosen and saved. And so it is in fact. Christ teaches us here, that God desires most earnestly the salvation of all men. He had already in eternity, therefore, ordained Christ to be the Savior of the whole fallen world, permitted Him to become man in the fulness of time, and as the Lamb of God to suffer and die for the sins of all sinners, thus reconciling the lost world with Himself. And now in order that all redeemed sinners may become partakers of eternal salvation, God invites them all into His kingdom, causes His grace to be carried and offered to all with equal earnestness and power, and in no instance neglects even the smallest thing that is necessary to save the individual. That not all are saved, not even the majority, but only a few, is not due to God's will, as though God did not earnestly desire that all should come, but secretly in His heart from the outset had picked out only a few unto salvation. He is displeased with those that do not come. The cause of their remaining away lies altogether in the conduct of men, in their contempt for the divine call of grace. God called them, but they would not come. Therefore they do not attain unto salvation. — Not all, however, curtly reject God's gracious call. Many come, many hear the

Word and outwardly enter the church of God. But among these also a separation takes place. Then "the king came in," so says the parable, to see his guests and discovered a man without a wedding garment. At the king's question: "Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment?" the man was speechless. By his silence he uttered his own condemnation. His speechlessness proves that it is his own fault that he is found without a wedding garment. The king therefore commands that he be cast out into outer darkness. Why is he cast out? Not because the king had not prepared a wedding garment for him, or had not offered it to him as earnestly as to the others. No; the king had done no more for others than for him, and no less for him than for others. He, however, had proudly refused the proffered garment, and was therefore discovered without it. However earnestly it had been offered to him — he is not clothed therein; and that is the reason why he is cast out. — Why do the others remain seated at the marriage board? Solely because they really wear this proffered garment, because the king sees them thus attired. Whether the wedding garment has been put on or refused decides the acceptance or rejection of the guests. — The wedding garment is the righteousness of Jesus Christ. This garment is put on through faith. God's eyes will seek for this righteousness at the last day. Where He finds this righteousness appropriated by faith, He saves; where this is not found, He casts out. It matters not if Christ have died for a man; it matters not if all grace have been offered to him ever so earnestly and often; it matters not if the Spirit of God have worked repeatedly upon his heart by means of the Word: if God does not behold him clothed in Christ's merit, then he is lost. Those, then, that are finally saved, inherit this blessing because they are in Christ, because they have laid hold of His merit in faith. Not our own works and merits, nor on the other hand, the mere pleasure of a secret divine will, but only the appropriation of the merit of Jesus Christ, will decide which sinners shall be saved. When now Christ closes this gospel, which enjoins this truth so impressively, declaring: "Many are called, but few are chosen", He evidently teaches that, as now in time, so also in eternity not the mere pleasure of a hidden will, but alone the merit of Jesus Christ embraced in faith decided which sinners should eternally be saved. As now in time, so also in eternity God's eyes sought for faith. As now in time God justifies and saves sinners only on

account of the merit of Jesus Christ apprehended in faith, so likewise in eternity, God decreed (or elected) to justify and save sinners only for the sake of Jesus Christ's merits appropriated by faith. Whomsoever His all-seeing eye beheld in the wedding garment of His Son, him He appointed unto salvation; whomsoever He found without this garment, him He was compelled to reject, glad as He would have been to elect him. Since now so few permit themselves through God's universal gracious call to be enveloped in this garment, the greater number wilfully thrusting it from them, it necessarily follows that of the many called but few are chosen. — Christ teaches also in this parable that God has elected according to the same plan, the same rule, that He follows in time in the justification and in the salvation of the sinner. This parable, therefore, shows us that God has certainly taken the rule of election from the plan of salvation.

Missouri rejects this pure biblical Lutheran explanation, and opposes it by an interpretation that is thoroughly Calvinistic. Missouri maintains: When Christ says, "Many are called, but few are chosen", He means to say: This parable sets forth, that it appears and becomes evident, that many are called, but only few are chosen. Although God has in general formed a decree to save all men according to an appointed order of salvation and therefore causes all men to be called, still He has according to a free purpose, already in eternity, chosen for Himself a certain number of persons and has resolved to call them, to bring them to faith, to preserve them in faith and to save them, in preference to others. And these who have thus been separated must be called, must come to faith, must persevere in faith and be saved, and beside them none else. This hidden counsel and decree now became evident in that only a few accepted the gracious call of God, the majority rejecting it. According to this, Christ would say here: God's having in His hidden counsel appointed only a few to the call, to faith, to perseverance and to salvation is the reason why so few accept the Word. Had God, as He could "just as easily" have done, elected many, had He elected all, then all would have come to faith and to salvation. Is this not true Calvinistic exegesis? The universal gracious will, intended for all with equal earnestness, is thus in fact undermined and destroyed; yea, the cause why so many are not saved is thus really transferred to the will of God, however much this may be

denied. Luther characterizes such exegesis by saying: "This is principally a godless explanation."

Our Confessions also reject this exegesis most emphatically. Let the inquirer read attentively §§ 34-42, where it is stated that the calling of the many and the choosing of the few is not founded upon the secret hidden will of God, as though God in the universal decree of grace revealed in the Word had not at heart had an earnest intention with respect to all, but with respect to a few only. For thus the universal counsel of grace would be made a pretense, yea, a lie. Just because God is in earnest with regard to all men alike, He causes His gracious will to be preached to all and to be sealed unto them in the sacraments and private absolution. And through this gracious counsel revealed in the Word the Holy Ghost would operate upon all that hear the Word, in order that they may be enlightened, converted, and saved. Where this effect is not attained, it is not because He did not desire to save such persons; nor is it because God's gracious call to them was not active and efficacious. But, earnest and efficacious as this universal gracious will is, it does not everywhere achieve its purpose; that is, it does not necessarily convert and save all. This will contains a condition upon which God makes its realization depend: it is an ordered will, and only in its order is it executed. God has ordained in His eternal counsel "that He will justify and save all those who, through true faith, receive Christ; He has also determined in His counsel that He will harden, reprobate, and condemn those who are called through the Word, if they reject the Word and resist the Holy Ghost, who wishes to be efficacious and to work in them through the Word." Our Confessions teach here that God has established this rule, this law, in His eternal counsel once for all. According to this rule He saves and condemns in time, according to this rule He has elected and reprobated in eternity. And in accordance with this principle, say the Confessions—therefore not according to the mere purpose of a hidden will—are we to understand that the Scriptures say: "Many are called, but few are chosen." (Muell. pp. 809-811.) Whilst according to Missouri's teaching the election of the few occurs in harmony with a mere purpose of the secret will of God, according to our Confessions it occurs in accordance with the order and the rule of the gracious will revealed in the Gospel: He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life. Missouri's interpretation is thus found flatly contradicting the Confessions.

Martin Chemnitz, the chief author of the Formula of Concord, explains this parable in his sermon on Predestination in exactly the same way as we do. Chemnitz does not say in a single syllable that God chose a number of people in accordance with a bare purpose, and resolved to bring these to faith and to preserve them therein, in preference to others; but he sets forth, upon the basis of this parable, all the eternal decrees through which God has established the universal way of salvation, as essential elements of election, and then shows how, in consequence of this universal order of grace, a selection from among the called has come about. But let us hear Chemnitz himself. He says: —

"The Lord teaches and specifies in this parable all that belongs to this article, and how one point always follows from the other, namely, that divine predestination or election consists in and embraces the following. When God foresaw that the human race would fall from Him through sin and would thereby sink beneath God's wrath and the devil's might into eternal ruin and damnation, He, the loving God, before the foundation of the world was laid, in His secret, divine counsel, considered, planned and decreed how to help the human race out of its ruin unto salvation. In the first place, His only Son should take unto Himself human nature, or, as the parable says, the king would arrange a marriage for His Son and would wed Him unto our human nature."

"Secondly, this Son should be made subject to the law, should be slain as an offering for our sins, and in this way everything necessary to the marriage joy of eternal salvation should be prepared through Him."

"Thirdly; He desired that not only the flesh and blood that His Son would assume into the unity of His person should partake of this salvation, but other guests also, not from among the fallen angels, but from the human race which was now allied and related to God's Son as His bride, because of the assumed human nature, and was therefore become flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone."

Fourthly, He would have His guests called to the marriage by His servants; that is, He would reveal this His heavenly counsel through the Word to the world and would call men to His kingdom by the spoken Word."

"Fifthly, He desired to work efficaciously upon men's hearts through this call, enlighten, convert, and save them."

"Sixthly, those whom He justified He would guard, protect, preserve, save, and glorify. Just as these particulars are also summed up one after the other, like a golden chain, by St. Paul in the beautiful passage, Romans 8, where he says: Whom He did predestinate, or ordain, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified."

"Seventh, because God foresaw that the wicked human heart would not heed, but resist, this call and operation of God, and would not accept the grace of God intended to work upon man, He decreed in His purpose that all who despised, blasphemed, and interfered with this His call, or, when He would operate in their hearts by His grace, did not heed the call, and persevered in their resistance, should be punished in time, and in eternity rejected and damned, as this parable also clearly sets forth."

"This is the simple understanding and meaning of what belongs to divine predestination, of what it embraces and whereon it rests. And when we speak or think of God's predestination or election, we must take all these parts together, as Paul throughout the whole first chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians treats and explains this doctrine part by part; and if I abide by this explanation of the matter and in this simplicity, I have as much as I need know about it, and know that I cannot go wrong or err.

Rom. 8, 28-30, is the next passage that we have to consider. It reads as follows: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified." The apostle desires in these, as in the preceding, verses to comfort Christians in their sufferings of the present time and to encourage them to patient endurance of these sufferings, by showing them that, because they are certain of God's love and therefore also of salvation, nothing can hurt them, but everything must serve to their advantage. He declares: "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God." Those that love God, and of these the apostle speaks here, are true Christians as distinguished from false and hypocritical Christians. In the four passages in which the Holy Scrip-

tures use this expression (1 Cor. 2, 9; 8, 3; Eph. 6, 24; James 1, 12) they employ it to denote nothing more and nothing less than true believers, children of God not only in name but also in fact. The apostle declares that nothing can conduce to their hurt, but that everything must prove for their benefit. And this is not something imaginary, but firm, certain truth. We know, writes the apostle; that is, we true, believing Christians are certain of it. But why are we so certain? The apostle tells us, when he proceeds with the words, "who are the called according to His purpose." True Christians are thus seen to be called according to a purpose; and because this is so, they know also with certainty that everything must help them on unto salvation. God's gracious plan has been published to them, and this not in vain. They have experienced the power of this call; it has opened their heart and kindled faith in them. That they are what they are, truly believing, God-loving Christians, they owe solely to this divine call of grace. Without the call they would to-day belong to the lost world. The fact, however, that God calling through His Word has delivered them out of the kingdom of darkness and has transplanted them through faith into the kingdom of grace, is assurance to them that God earnestly desires their eternal salvation, and that everything must serve them to this end. For this call was not issued accidentally to them, so as to occasion the fear that it might accidentally leave them in the lurch; on the contrary, their call rests upon an express, divine purpose, according to which God had resolved to lead them to salvation. — Of what kind is the purpose that God has resolved upon and decreed? Missouri claims that this divine purpose does not denote the universal plan of salvation, according to which God had decreed to save men in an appointed way, namely, through faith in Christ; but that this word denotes the special, unconditionally effective decree, framed concerning certain persons only, by virtue of which God has undertaken to call some rather than others, to bring them to faith and preserve them therein, and to save them eternally; in short, purpose is the same as "election"; to be called according to the purpose means to be called "on account of election." Missouri then makes the apostle say to Christians: We Christians that love God know that everything must work together for our good, because we are not called, as are others, on the basis of the universal plan of grace, but according to the purpose — on the basis of election. That this exegesis is false is

evident from the fact that thus a twofold call is taught, one according to the purpose and one apart from the purpose. Experience bears witness that many are called who either never come to faith, or who do not abide in faith and love and are therefore lost. "Many indeed are the called, but few are the elect." The many evidently could not be called on the basis of election, simply because they were not elected. Their call, then, was, according to the Missourian explanation of these words, no call according to the purpose, but apart from the purpose; their call happened altogether accidentally, and as it happened accidentally, so also accidentally it came to naught. God had not so much as undertaken their call, and therefore the call did not attain its goal. Others, on the other hand, were called according to the purpose. Concerning these God had resolved that they, only they, and none else, shall and must come to faith, persevere in faith, and be saved. And God "necessarily" accomplishes this resolution. Of course these elect must also be led to heaven according to the plan of salvation; they must therefore be called. But their call must attain its purpose; it can not be despised, for it is a call according to the purpose. The Scriptures know nothing of such a Calvinistic double call. As the Scriptures know of but one universal redemption, so do they know also of but one universal call. And just as certainly as God, according to the Scriptures, does nothing in time that He has not already in eternity resolved to do, so certainly does the call of every person rest upon the purpose. Wherever the call is extended, it is not accidental, but purposed. It is evident that this divine purpose can not, as Missouri maintains, mean a special counsel of election; this becomes clear when we examine what the Scriptures say, in the different passages where the word is used. We thus learn that the purpose was already formed in eternity (Eph. 3, 11); that it is not based on human merit, but alone on God's grace (2 Tim. 1, 9); that it does not depend on anything outside of God, but alone on the "counsel of His own will" (Eph. 1, 11). The object and goal of this divine purpose, so the Scriptures further tell us, is the salvation of the world. Upon this purpose rest, out of it flow, from it proceed, the world-embracing redemption (Eph. 3, 8-12), the call (2 Tim. 1, 9), the appointment to sonship and the inheritance (Eph. 1, 5-11). According to the Scriptures, this purpose was "purposed in Christ Jesus"; that is, as God, in His purpose, had appointed Christ to be the only Savior of sinners, so also has He determined

to save eternally, not without Christ, not apart from Christ, but alone in Christ, i. e. those only who are in Christ, who believe in Him. Therefore this purpose is called Rom. 9, 11, "the purpose according to election", i. e. a purpose so framed, that in it a choice of those to be saved out of the mass of mankind is made. For God has not resolved to save all absolutely, but only those who believe in Christ. What, now, is this purpose of which the apostle speaks when he says: "The called according to His purpose"? Surely, not a new counsel, differing from the universal counsel of grace, so that God, without reference to faith or unbelief, out of the mere free pleasure of His secret will chose for Himself a certain number of men, and resolved to call these in preference to others, to bring them to faith and to preserve them therein; but it is the divine decree formed in eternity, not based on human merit, but on God's free grace, as regards its final realization bound by God Himself to faith as a condition: and upon this decree rest the universal redemption, the universal call, conversion, justification and salvation of sinners. It is, as our Confessions say, the purpose, counsel, will and appointment of God, pertaining to our redemption, call, justification and salvation. It is the eternal decree in which God — as the Confessions elsewhere say — has resolved "that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him" (Epitome XI, 12, p. 556). It is the purpose of which Christ says: "And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6, 40). Because God has made this decree of salvation in eternity, He causes men to be called efficaciously in time, thus overcoming their hearts, so that they receive His Word and assent thereto. Upon His purpose rests the call And as certainly as this gracious purpose of God is executed in the call of true Christians, and as certainly as God desires to lead them to a blessed end, so certainly their sufferings can not tend to their hurt. If purpose did not here mean the universal counsel of salvation revealed in the Gospel, if it meant, as Missouri teaches, a hidden, essentially different counsel, the call would offer the Christian no comfort. He could then never be certain that everything must serve for his advantage. For he would continually be subject to the fear: What if you are not called according to the purpose? — Before he could have any real comfort, he would have to be absolutely sure that he is called according to the hid-

den purpose that hovers over only a few persons. But where shall he find this certainty? — However much Missouri prides itself on assuring Christians of their salvation by this doctrine of election, it really robs them of all comfort. In the following verse the apostle shows in how far those who are the called according to the purpose are the persons for whom all things must work together for good. He writes: "For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren." He here calls attention to the divine order and appointment contained in the universal decree of salvation, to lead to glory with certainty all those that love God. But that no one might entertain the thought, that this decree was not executed according to the revealed plan of grace, but according to the mere pleasure of a secret will, the apostle makes this appointment to be dependent on divine foresight, for he declares that God has appointed those to glory "whom He did foreknow." "Whom He did foreknow" — these words are of the highest importance in the present controversy. What do they mean? Missouri claims: to love, elect, predestinate. Thus we read, e. g. in the Western District Minutes of 1879: We are to understand by this expression nothing else than: He loves them, He has chosen them, elected, received them as His own and recognizes them as His loved ones (compare p. 28 and "L. and W.", 1880).

That "foreknow" can not here mean "elect" is shown first by the context. This passage has often and rightly been likened to a chain. As in a chain one ring is attached to the next, yet each is a link by itself, so with respect to the individual sentences of this passage: one member is coupled to the next: glorification, to justification, justification to calling, calling to predestination, predestination to foreknowledge. Everything is finally based on the eternal divine counsel of salvation. That is the foundation which supports everything. From this point the process is by way of foreknowledge to predestination in eternity, and by way of calling to justification and salvation in time. A different act of God is denoted by each member of the sentence. As is evidently the case in verse 30, where the different stages of the way of salvation — calling, justifying, glorifying — are mentioned, so also in verse 29, where the eternal acts of God — foreknowledge and predestination — are described. For, just as there the apostle makes glorification dependent on justification and justification

on calling, so here he makes predestination dependent on foreknowledge. As little as calling, justification and glorification are one and the same thing, so little are foreknowledge and predestination one and the same. The Missourian exegesis, however, makes the apostle say one and the same thing in both words. According to Missouri the words: call, justify, glorify, form by themselves one chain which is forged to the rock of an absolute predestination. This rock is described by the three words: purpose, foreknowledge, predestination. But not only does this exegesis destroy the connection of the discourse, it also ascribes to the apostle trifling, insipid words. Stop a moment and consider: from the Missourian standpoint "according to the purpose" means "on the basis of election", "foreknow" means "elect", and to predestinate to glory means again to elect. The apostle would then make this revelation to the Christians at Rome: You are called according to election, for whom He has elected, them He has elected! How? Has Paul really written such meaningless words? — Missouri herself has felt with what difficulties this interpretation is beset. In order to give the thing a better look, the declaration was afterwards made that foreknow means: a divine act before the dawn of time, by virtue of which God already in eternity accepted certain persons as His own, devoted them to Himself, made them His own, placed them in communion with Himself ("L. u. W.", 1880, pp. 200 sqq.). These swelling words may have made the matter as clear as daylight for some and may have completely satisfied them; but in fact they do not better the matter, they only veil it a little more. The gist of this statement too is: foreknow means elect. For when God adopts according to His mere pleasure, one sinner in preference to another, He thereby predestinates him to glory, elects him to salvation. This latest Missourian interpretation can have no signification but this: Whom God elected, He elected. As certainly as the holy apostle does not utter such nonsense, so certainly also foreknow, in the light of the context, can not mean elect. In the first place the sense of foreknow (proginoskein) does not allow of such an interpretation. Nowhere do the Holy Scriptures use foreknow in this sense. This meaning of foreknow has simply been invented, invented by Calvin, adopted by Hofmann, rehashed by P. Stoeckhardt. In the entire Bible proginoskein means nothing else than to foreknow, to know beforehand, to recognize beforehand. That this is at least the fundamental meaning of the word even our

opponents must concede. When Paul says: "The Lord knoweth them that are His" (2 Tim. 2, 19), that does not mean: He makes them His own, loves them as His own, but: He knows which are His. When the same apostle again says, Rom. 11, 2: "God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew", that does not mean: His people that He elected, but: His people that He knew beforehand, namely as His people. The sense of the passage is: Although hardening has befallen the greater part of Israel, God has not on that account cast away His people; for not all the descendants of Abraham are God's people, but only those that have the faith of Abraham. And this His foreknown people God hath not cast off. When it is said (1 Pet. 1, 18-20): "Ye were redeemed . . . . with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ: Who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times for your sake", — to foreknow here does not mean to appoint beforehand, but to know beforehand. The apostle would say: Christ has indeed been revealed in the last times as the innocent, spotless lamb of God, slain for our sins. But God has foreknown and recognized this from eternity. True, Christ has certainly been foreordained by God to be the atonement for our sins; however, that is not what the apostle says here, but, that God knew Him from eternity to be such an offering. In short: Nowhere in the Scriptures is foreknow to be confounded with foreordain, elect, join in fellowship with one's self: wherever the Holy Scriptures use this word, it retains its original meaning: know, recognize, beforehand. No matter if this foreknowing as well as knowing be followed by love, or even include this in itself, it still remains a knowing, and a knowing is what the Scriptures understand thereby. Our passage therefore remains unchanged: whom He foreknew; and not: whom He predestinated. — It is a fundamental principle of Lutheran exegesis that we dare not depart from the native sense of words unless compelled to do so, especially not in passages that form the foundation of an article of faith. Therefore our Church has so severely reproved the Reformed for having forsaken the letter in the words concerning the Lord's Supper. As in the words concerning the Lord's Supper, so here also we have a passage that is the seat of an article of faith. Nevertheless, Missouri does not scruple to infuse into these words a sense that they do not have and can not have, whether we consider the words themselves or

the connection in which they occur. Is that less blameworthy than the perversions of the words of the Lord's Supper on the part of the Reformed? In order to justify this perversion of the word "know", Matt. 11, 27 is appealed to: "And no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." Here, say our opponents, to know must mean "to love"; but not even here can this be the meaning. The words: "to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him", prevent such an explanation; for, reveal is to teach. If there were any passage where "know" meant merely "love", it would be this one; but here knowing is not excluded. It is therefore impossible that in the words, "Whom He did foreknow", knowing or recognizing, the act whereby one person is seen to differ from another, should be excluded.

If we ask: What has God foreknown these people to be, whom He has predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son? the answer, according to the preceding verse can only be: He has recognized them as true believing children of God. And that God, also with regard to faith, looks into the future, is proved by John 17, 20: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word." The same thing is proved by 1 Tim. 1, 16: "Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in the first Jesus Christ might shew forth all long-suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting." "Should" is here used, if we examine the original, in the sense of "would." . . . The apostle would say: I am become a pattern unto them that will hereafter believe in Him. As God, in the light of these passages, has looked upon future believers, even so has He also in the appointment of certain persons to salvation looked upon their future faith. When the holy apostle says: "Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son", he would say: Whom God has foreknown or recognized as such, who in consequence of the execution of His universal plan of salvation would believe in Christ, these He has also appointed to be conformed to the image of His Son, both here in suffering and hereafter in glory. —

It is clear from the whole eighth chapter of Romans that this is the meaning of the passage. The apostle, before reaching this passage in the eighth chapter, draws a sharp line, and places some on the one side and others on the other side of the line.

Verse 1: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." The antithesis to this appears in verses 7, 8, and 13: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die." The meaning of the holy apostle is briefly this: In those that are in Christ there is nothing damnable: in those that are outside of Christ everything is damnable. Whether or not one is in Christ is determined by whether he walks after the Spirit or after the flesh. But those that walk after the flesh are outside of Christ. — Verse 14: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." The antithesis, according to the foregoing, is: Those that are not led by the Spirit of God are not God's children. — Verse 17: "And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together." The antithesis is: If we are not children, or permit ourselves to be alienated by suffering, we shall not become heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ, and we shall not be glorified. — Verse 28: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God." The antithesis: To them that do not love God, all things work together for ruin. What a pressing admonition for Christians lies in this passage, that they may strive to be in Christ through faith, may love God, and follow the leading and prompting of the Holy Spirit! And now should the apostle say, verse 29: Oh, God has from eternity elected and predestinated you to the infallible attainment of salvation, without even inquiring whether you would be in Christ through faith? ! No; he can only mean: Those, of whom He in His omniscience foresaw that they, in consequence of the execution of His universal plan or purpose of salvation would believe in Christ, He has predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son. But these are the very ones who, according to the preceding verse, love God. Therefore it is said in 1 Cor. 8, 3: "But if any man love God, the same is known of Him." And, as though the apostle would completely anticipate the idea, that God had dealt arbitrarily in His appointment to glorification, he presents the stages of the execution in time of the eternal decree, saying, verse 30: "Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called." (These have not been called in vain. For, although the call can be despised and actually is

despised by the greater part of mankind, yet this point is not here considered since the apostle speaks of the predestinated, of those concerning whom God foreknew that they would come to faith, that they would not maliciously and stubbornly resist the call of the Word.) "And whom He called" (and who thereby became truly believing Christians, verse 28.), "them He also justified" (God justifies believers only, therefore reference is had here to the called who have become believing through the Word.) "And whom He justified, them He also glorified." (Glorification, in fact, is still in the future; has, however, together with justification, as good as taken place. God leads His own, as far as He is concerned, from stage to stage.) Thus the execution in time of the eternal decree proceeds, according to the apostle's words, through the faith-creating call to justification, and through justification to glorification. God carries out His eternal decree in time by working faith through the call, justifying believers, and saving and glorifying the justified. In the light of the temporal execution of the decree the apostle shows us what divine election is. For the decree and the execution must correspond perfectly. In the same manner, in the same order in which God now in time actually saves men, in that order He has also appointed them to salvation. As, in time, in justification and salvation faith is presupposed, so the eternal appointment presupposed faith. As God justifies and saves only those who are already believers, so He appointed unto salvation such only as were already (according to His foreknowledge) believers. In directing our attention to the execution of the decree, the apostle says that election did not take place according to a hidden free purpose, but according to the rule followed out in the plan of salvation. Whoever is on the way to salvation, being called and justified, can and should draw the comforting assurance for himself, that he belongs to the elect; only, he must suffer with Christ (verse 17), and must kill the works of the flesh (verse 13); and for this conflict God will furnish him with the necessary strength, as St Paul shows farther on in this chapter. — This passage, Rom. 8, 28-30, does not afford the slightest support for teaching the election of certain individuals, according to a free purpose, unto the call and unto faith; it rather teaches most unequivocally that God, in the predestination of certain persons unto salvation in preference to others, not only had regard to Christ's merit in so far as it would be acquired for us, but also as to whether that merit would be

grasped and accepted through faith, in short: this passage teaches that God has elected in view of faith.

This interpretation is confirmed by the ninth, tenth and eleventh chapters of Romans. Our opponents indeed try to explain Rom. 9, 18: "Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth", as though God, in the bestowal or the denial of His grace, did not act according to the revealed rule: "He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned", but according to pure arbitrariness. This, however, is a shameful perversion of the words. For, throughout these three chapters, treating as they do of the rejection of the Jews as God's people, the thought expressed in Rom. 9, 32, extends like a scarlet thread: "Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law." That it is still God's gracious will to save the Jews also, is proved by Rom. 10, 12. 13: "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." It is true that God has mercy upon whom He will have mercy, and hardens whom He will, but He has determined in His counsel "that He will justify and save all those who, through true faith, receive Christ; He has also determined in His counsel that He will harden, reprobate and condemn those who are called through the Word, if they reject the Word, and resist the Holy Ghost, who wishes to be efficacious and to work in them through the Word. And for this reason 'many are called, but few are chosen.'" (Form. Conc., Mueller, p. 713.) The rule according to which God has mercy or hardens is plainly and clearly revealed.

A third passage, of primary importance in showing that election took place on account of the merit of Jesus Christ apprehended in faith, is Eph. 1, 3-6: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us accepted in the beloved." The apostle begins with praise to God for having blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places. God

has blessed us, says the apostle; whom does he mean by the word "us"? He means, first of all, himself and those to whom he writes. But he was a believing Christian, and so were those to whom he addressed himself. He calls them "saints" and "faithful in Christ Jesus." The apostle includes in the word "us" believing Christians in general. These are blessed by God. And for this the apostle praises God.

Wherewith has God blessed them? "With all spiritual blessings in heavenly places", answers the apostle. He means all the gifts that Christ has acquired, as forgiveness of sins, righteousness, freedom from death and the devil, sonship, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the peace of God, inheritance of eternal life, etc.

If we ask further: How have the Christians become partakers of these spiritual blessings? the apostle answers, "in Christ." What does "in Christ" mean? Does it mean: for Jesus Christ's sake, so that the idea would be simply this — Christ has acquired these blessings and made it possible for God to bless us? Missouri claims this to be the meaning. But this is not the meaning. Had the apostle wanted to say merely this, he would have written "for Christ's sake", and not "in Christ." "In Christ" means more than for Christ's sake. Wherever these words occur in Holy Scripture they mean: in communion with Christ. Communion with Christ, however, is impossible except through faith. "In Christ" means then: to stand in believing fellowship with Christ. That this is correct is shown by the following passages: Eph. 2, 13: "But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ." Likewise 3, 21. Also Rom. 8, 1: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." When now the apostle says: "He has blessed us in Christ", his meaning is: God has given His only begotten and beloved Son to the world, and in Him has prepared for the world all that it needs. Forgiveness, righteousness, life and salvation are in Christ, and in Him alone. He that would have and enjoy these spiritual blessings must be in Christ. Outside of Him there is no forgiveness, but only a curse, no life, but only death, no salvation, but only hell. Only in Him, only in believing fellowship with Him, is the blessing to be had and enjoyed. That men may partake of this blessing, God gives His Word and Sacraments and operates through these by His Holy Spirit, in order to lead the hearts of men to true repentance and faith. All men who use

the means of grace and do not wilfully resist are brought to faith, are united by faith with Christ and as believers in Christ have and enjoy also the spiritual blessing in heavenly places. In Christ, then, in believing fellowship with Him or, what is the same, for the sake of the merit of Jesus Christ embraced in faith, have we become partakers of the spiritual blessing in heavenly places.

When the apostle continues in the following verse: "According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world", he establishes a comparison between God's blessing in time and election in eternity, and says: God has blessed us in the same way in which He has elected us. The apostle presents the act of blessing in time and the act of election in eternity as acts corresponding perfectly. If one would rightly understand eternal election, let him consider how God in time blesses men with spiritual and heavenly gifts. The same order that God followed now, He also followed in eternity in the matter of election. The rule and the order, according to which God separates His people in time from the world and receives them as His children and heirs of everlasting life, are the same order and rule according to which in eternity in His divine counsel He separated them from the world and predestinated them to be His children and heirs of everlasting life. Here in time we are blessed in Christ: before the foundation of the world election took place in the same way — in Christ. The apostle says: "According as He hath chosen us in Him." In Christ, not into Christ, not for Christ's sake, but in Christ. All spiritual blessing in heavenly places is locked up in Christ: the eternal election of the Father is locked up in Christ. Christ is, as it were, the compass within which election took place. Therefore the Church sings: "O God, in Thy dear Son have I been chosen from eternity", and, "In Thy deep wounds let me discover my election." Here the Lutheran and the Calvinistic doctrines of election separate. The Lutheran doctrine of election lives, moves, and has its being in the expression "in Christ." This "in Christ" is her heartbeat. The position of the Lutheran Church is in complete agreement with the revealed counsel of grace. The Calvinistic doctrine starts from the free purpose of a hidden will. According to this position the election of those who are to be saved takes place in a hidden abyss. The mere pleasure of God decides who are to be saved and who are not. Christ is thus abased until He becomes either the mere means of the execution of this purpose, as the most positive Calvinists declare, or at least,

as in the case of Missouri, Christ is retained as the foundation of election in so far as "by His merit He made it possible for God to elect sinful men." With respect to the selection of individuals, however, Christ's merit has properly nothing to do. There the mere pleasure of God decides. The election itself does not take place in Christ. The apostle teaches quite differently here. He says: Just as in time God blesses us in Christ, even so has He in eternity elected in Christ. If faith can be excluded from being considered in connection with the blessing here in time, then also can it be disregarded in contemplating eternal election. But if faith can not be excluded in the former case, then it can not be overlooked in the latter, for the apostle joins both together by the words "according as." But now faith can not be shut out when we speak of the blessing in time, therefore it is not to be shut out when we speak of the election in eternity. As only he can share the blessing in time who is in Christ, who stands in believing fellowship with Christ, so he only could be elected whom God saw in Christ, in believing fellowship with Christ. He who was outside of Christ was also outside of the circle of election within which the choice was made, and therefore could not be chosen. As in time God is governed by the plan of salvation in the actual acceptance unto sonship and heirship, so also before the foundation of the world in the predestination unto sonship and heirship He was governed by the plan of salvation. As in time God does not impute Christ's righteousness nor receive unto sonship and heirship when Christ's merit is not apprehended by faith, so also in eternity has He not appointed unto the certain attainment of Christ's righteousness and eternal life when He did not foresee faith in Christ. He has elected only whom God, according to His omniscience, saw in Christ through faith; those whom He did not see in Christ, He did not and could not elect. For God, "in His eternal divine counsel determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him" (Conc. Form. Epitome, No. 12). True, the elect were not, at the time of their election, actually in Christ, save in God's foreknowledge; they were not even in existence. God, therefore, if He was to elect at all, had to look into the future. Because He is the omniscient God, in whose sight "everything is naked and open", He saw from all eternity all the millions that would ever live and die. And He saw them either in Adam or in Christ. But in Adam there is nothing save death and ruin; in Christ alone

are redemption, life, and eternal happiness (Rom. 5, 14-19). Therefore God could not have beheld those whom He elected, as being in Adam, but rather as being in Christ, as believers. Our opponents, in their doctrine of election, separate faith from God's grace and Christ's merit and put it on the same plane with works. But faith, as repeatedly remarked, is not here considered as a work or virtue, but as the hand through which God's grace and Christ's merit are accepted. Faith, grace, Christ always belong together. Therefore our Confessions say: "As often, therefore, as mercy is spoken of, faith in the promise must be added, and this faith makes a distinction between those by whom salvation is attained and those by whom it is not attained. Faith makes the distinction between the worthy and the unworthy, because eternal life has been promised to the justified; and faith justifies." (Apology, Mueller, p. 144.)

From the following verses also, in which the apostle declares whereunto God has elected us, it appears that God, when He elected, sought for faith. He says first of all, that God has chosen us "that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love." Accordingly, the purpose and goal of election is a holy, God-pleasing life. Since, however, a holy life in love is not possible where faith does not dwell in the heart, — for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" — it follows that those who were chosen by God before the foundation of the world that they should be holy in love, were already before the all-seeing eye of God in Christ, were already in faith, before they were chosen; for as unbelievers they could never have been appointed unto holiness in love. As in time no one is brought to lead a holy life in love except he have first believed, so God in eternity resolved to lead no one unto such a holy life of whom He did not see that he would believe in Christ.

The second thing that the apostle names as the object and goal of election is sonship. "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself." What do these words mean? Sonship means in the Holy Scriptures: Adoption and the relation thus established between believers and God. Through adoption believing Christians have been delivered from the state of wrath and the curse, to which they belong by nature, and transplanted into a state of grace; and in this state, for the sake of Christ's righteousness embraced in faith, they have obtained the forgiveness of their sins and the promise of the eternal inheritance, and as an earnest and pledge of this there has been

given them the Holy Ghost, through whom they, being free from all fear of God as the strict Judge, cry out: "Abba, Father." This childlike relation in which Christians live with God is intended in our passage, when the apostle speaks of the adoption of children. He would say this: By electing us in Christ, God has determined to bring us through Christ into such a relation with Himself, as that which exists between dear children and their loving father. — In this "predestinated unto adoption" Missouri tries to find its election unto faith. "In the idea of adoption", says "Lehre und Wehre", "the idea of faith is included. It is therefore altogether scriptural to say: God has predestinated us unto faith." (1880, p. 237.) This is by no means the case. To preordain to adoption is not — to preordain unto faith. Our fathers have incontrovertibly established this over against the Calvinists, who, just as Missouri, would like to prove their election unto faith from these words. For the refutation of this objection a passage from the celebrated writings of the great theologian John Gerhard may be in place. He writes: "We say, the consideration of faith belongs to the decree of election. This is not contradicted by the statement of the apostle that God has chosen us unto the adoption of children. We furnish the proof: God has formed a decree to receive certain persons from the lost human race as His children and finally to save them (for with this adoption eternal life is most intimately united, Rom. 8, 17). Of what nature the decree was is shown by the execution of it. As in time men become partakers of the adoption through faith, so the consideration of faith can not be excluded from the appointment unto adoption and eternal salvation. Whom God accepts as His children in time, He has also resolved to accept in eternity; and in what manner God in time accepts certain ones as children, in the same manner He has decreed to accept them in eternity: therefore the consideration of the faith to be bestowed, as well as of the foreseen faith, belongs to the decree of election. The apostle says expressly: "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself"; He has elected us in Christ; but God could not elect men in Christ without regard to faith, since faith alone joins us to Christ and unites with Him. We therefore compare with this apostolic expression the passage John 1, 12: "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name." As, therefore, God offers here in time the blessing

of adoption through faith, so He has from eternity formed the decree to accept those as children and to constitute them as heirs, concerning whom He foresaw that they, by the help of the Holy Spirit through the Word, would perseveringly believe in Christ." (Loc. Theol. IV, p. 212). — Far from teaching an election unto faith, these words rather most gloriously confirm the doctrine that God has elected in view of faith; for adoption follows faith, if not in point of time, yet in the nature of the case, as Gerhard here unanswerably proves.

If we ask: What is the cause that in eternity moved God to elect a sinner out of the lost mass of mankind unto salvation? the apostle here answers: Only this — the merit of Jesus Christ, not merely as acquired, but also as appropriated; or: the merit of Jesus Christ apprehended (according to the foresight of God) in faith. The apostle does not teach in our passage an election unto faith, but certainly an election in foresight or in view of faith. Election in the strictest sense presupposes faith. Only when one speaks of election comprehensively, as does the Formula of Concord, where the various provisions of the universal plan of salvation and the choice of individuals are understood, only then can one say that that faith flows from election.

Furthermore, 2 Thess. 2, 13, is an exceedingly important passage in the present controversy. It reads: "But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." If these words clearly and plainly teach anything, it is that God has chosen the elect, not unto faith, to say nothing of choosing them unto the call, but in sanctification and in faith unto salvation; that therefore not the mere pleasure of God, but Jesus Christ's merit embraced in faith, decided their eternal appointment unto salvation. The Missourians therefore fear this passage most of all. It causes them the most trouble. Therefore several explanations of the passage have been tried, but so far their attempts have miserably failed.

The Minutes of the Western District, 1877, bring forward the following explanation, p. 30: "Paul would say: We are elected unto sanctification of the Spirit and unto belief of the truth. . . . We have been elected from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and in faith, in order that we may be in sanctification and in faith, i. e. in obedience to God's Word." Although

the apostle expressly says: "in sanctification — in faith God has elected you", the "in" is changed by a cunning stroke into "unto" and we have the following: God has elected unto sanctification and unto faith. Although the apostle mentions "sanctification of the Spirit" first, letting "belief of the truth" follow, thereby indicating that he does not speak here of the sanctification of life, which follows faith, but of sanctification in the wider sense, namely the work of the Holy Spirit, through which faith is wrought; still, regardless of the apostle's order, no scruples are shown about understanding "sanctification of the Spirit" to mean sanctification of life and explaining "belief of the truth" by: obedience to God's Word. In this manner "election unto faith" has successfully been explained into the present verse! — But is not that revising the Holy Spirit's work after a terrible fashion and "taking Him under instruction as though He did not know how to express what He wanted to reveal"?

Later on, it seemed advisable to Missouri, in order "to proceed more safely", to renounce this explanation, so evidently contradictory to the clear words of Scripture. But instead of accepting the interpretation which most forcibly urges itself upon every unprejudiced reader of the Scriptures, they have tried another, which is in fact not another, for it only veils the matter a little better. They have granted that sanctification of the Spirit does not denote sanctification of life, as the Minutes of 1877 declared, but the whole work of the Holy Spirit, namely, that the Holy Ghost "calls us by the gospel, enlightens us with His gifts, sanctifies and keeps us in the true faith." They have further conceded that they must give up the explanation: unto sanctification and unto faith, which the Minutes of '77 defended. Still more decidedly have they rejected the interpretation: God has elected you through sanctification and through belief of the truth; to represent man's faith as a means of election, which is an act of God, they consider a most unhappy thought. Just how this is an unhappy thought, it is hard to discover. Justification is certainly an act of God, as well as election. And yet every page of the Scriptures tells us that we are justified by faith; and our Church believes, teaches and confesses that faith is the means of justification, of this act of God. Is this too, perhaps, an awkward notion, of which a St. Louis professor can no longer conceive? — St. Louis therefore prefers to understand "through sanctification and through belief" as denoting the way and manner in which

God has elected. And we too can be content with this. We are fully satisfied with this exegesis, if only these words are really understood of the way and manner in which God has elected, of the mode of election, of the order in which the election of certain individuals has taken place. More than this we really do not want. But this is something altogether different from what Prof. Stoeckhardt makes out of this way and manner in which God has elected. He makes it to mean this: "God has elected to salvation in such a way, that He at the same time embraced in salvation sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. . . . The apostle would then say: When God formed the eternal decree of election to salvation, ... He did it in such a way that He at the same time adopted faith, as the means and the way of salvation, into that eternal act of His will. When God predestinated you unto salvation He at the same time and by this act determined to sanctify you through His Holy Spirit and to lead you to belief of the Gospel . . . . or, in short: you shall be saved through the ministration of the Holy Spirit and through faith. . . . It is the same whether one says: God has predestinated each and every one of the elect unto faith and unto salvation" ("L. u. W.", 1880, p. 235.) What does all this talk say but this: "chosen through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" means still: elected unto sanctification, unto the call, unto faith. At first this interpretation is renounced, in order "to proceed more safely"; but now the same thing is trotted out again, embellished a little better, and receives the name "way and manner" in which God has resolved to save the elect. God has elected in faith is to mean: God has picked out, according to a secret, hidden will, a certain number of persons for Himself, and at the same time decreed to bring these unto faith, to preserve them in faith and to save them through faith. But where does the apostle say that? God hath chosen you through sanctification and belief of the truth, he says; but where is it written: in choosing you, God has at the same time resolved to save you by the way of faith? That is nowhere contained in this passage. Prof. Stoeckhardt makes that addition, in order to introduce his election unto faith. — Oh, that the Reverend Professors at St. Louis would at length heed what was once written in "L. u. W.": "What creature in heaven or on earth has a right to add aught to the words of the Holy Spirit and complete them from the resources of his reason as though the Scriptures were incomplete?"

"God hath chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" — Missouri is not able to overcome this passage. It is so clear and immovable that even the skill of the St. Louis masters is here brought to shame. This text remains unshaken over against all their attempts at expounding or impounding it: elected in sanctification of the Spirit, not unto the call; elected in faith, not unto faith. We may appropriately apply here the saying: "Thy word stands firm as a wall, no man can pervert it, however skillful he be." This one passage upsets Missouri's Calvinizing doctrine of election. Let us observe these important words somewhat more closely. We find all the chief points of the doctrine of election here stated. The apostle says to the Christians at Thessalonica: God has elected you, i. e. He has chosen you for Himself from among the lost, ruined world, has dedicated you in preference to others unto Himself. And when did this take place? "From the beginning," says the apostle, which is manifestly the same as: "before the foundation of the world", Eph. 1, 4. And whereunto has God elected? Not unto the call, not unto faith, as Missouri claims, but unto salvation, answers the apostle. If we ask: What men has God elected? in what condition, in what disposition were they when God appointed them unto salvation? then the apostle gives us an answer so clear and definite, that it is scarcely conceivable how Lutheran Christians can longer remain in the dark regarding this question. The apostle says: "God hath chosen you in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth." What do these words mean? "Sanctification of the Spirit", as already remarked, and as conceded by Prof. Stoeckhardt, can not here denote sanctification in the narrow sense, not the God-pleasing life of the Christian flowing from faith. This appears from the fact, that the apostle places sanctification first and faith afterward. If the apostle had wanted to speak here of the sanctification of life, he would surely have written: in faith and in sanctification. By sanctification of the Spirit the apostle understands what that expression embraces in its wider sense, the work of the Holy Spirit upon the sinner in rescuing him from the doomed world and transplanting him into redeeming, saving communion with God, advancing and preserving him therein; or as our catechism expresses it: "calls us by the Gospel, enlightens us with His gifts, sanctifies and keeps us in true faith." Sanctification then really consists in this, that the Holy Ghost kindles and preserves faith in man's heart. For in

faith alone does the sinner have fellowship with God. On this account the apostle adds the words: "in belief of the truth." What do these words say? The truth is God's Word — "Thy Word is truth", John 17, 17, — the Gospel — "After that ye heard the Word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation", Eph. 1, 13 — above all things Christ Himself — "I am the way, the truth, and the life", John 14, 6. "Belief of the truth", then, is faith in the Gospel, faith in Christ — a faith that trusts in the message of salvation as undoubted truth, a faith that embraces Christ's merit. The Holy Spirit alone produces this faith, and in doing so He sanctifies the sinner. When the apostle says: "God hath chosen in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth", he designates sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth (the belief wrought by the Holy Ghost and apprehending Christ's merit) as the sphere, the circle, in which eternal election moves and is executed. The apostle, consequently, says really the same here that he declares, Eph. 1, 4, in the words: "He hath chosen us in Him" (Christ). For where the Scriptures speak of faith, they always include Christ's merit; and where they speak of Christ's merit as the cause of our salvation, they always include faith. Hence, when we speak of our salvation, Christ and faith dare never be separated. As in Eph. 1, 4, so also here, the apostle teaches that the merit of Jesus Christ, grasped by faith, has decided election. Only, it is more explicitly taught here than there that reference to faith dare not be excluded from the divine decree of election; yet at the same time, that this faith is indeed not man's own work, but solely the work of the Holy Spirit. This faith, effected by the Holy Ghost and apprehending the merit of Christ, is the necessary condition that precedes the selective appointment to salvation. If we ask: What men in preference to others did God in eternity choose out for Himself and appoint unto salvation? The apostle gives us the answer: God has from eternity elected to salvation all those individuals, and those only, of whom He, by virtue of His omniscience, foresaw that they, through the power and operation of the Holy Ghost, would believe and embrace Christ's merit — those whom His all-seeing eye, penetrating the future, already saw in the condition of divinely effected faith.

That this is the only correct interpretation of our passage appears from the context. In the preceding verses the apostle has foretold the appearance of antichirst and the apostasy of many that would be corrupted and believe a lie, and testifies that their

being deluded is their reward for not having received the love of the truth. A divine judgment is executed upon them, God Himself delivering them over to delusion and the belief of a lie, not as though HE did not most earnestly desire their salvation, but in order to punish them for having wilfully despised the divine message of salvation. For it is, undoubtedly, God's irrevocable decree to deliver those into judgment who do not in faith accept the Gospel: since, now, the apostle does not speak of a judgment decreed against present, but against future scorners, — he is prophesying concerning the days of antichrist — he declares that God has resolved in eternity to abandon to judgment all those whose wilful unbelief He foresaw. The apostle evidently contrasts the elect with the reprobate, when he proceeds: "But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." Whilst St. Paul says of the reprobate that they have been rejected because they did not receive the love of the truth, would not believe, he says of the elect that they are chosen to salvation "in belief of the truth". It would be impossible for the apostle to say that the elect, in that moment of eternity when God decided who should infallibly be saved and who not, appeared before God's eyes as unbelievers, just as did the reprobate; and that whilst God has rejected these on account of their unbelief, He has chosen those, the elect, in accord with the free pleasure of His secret will, appointed them to faith, and resolved to lead them infallibly upon the way of faith unto salvation. For then the real ground of reprobation would not lie, as the apostle previously said, in wilful unbelief, but in the will of God. The apostle would then have contradicted himself in two verses immediately following one upon another, by first assigning rejection to the wilful unbelief of man, and in the next verse transferring, indirectly at least, this rejection to the divine will. As impossible as this is, so impossible is it for the words, elected "in faith", to mean: ordained irrevocably according to a free purpose in preference to others, unto faith, and upon this way of faith unto salvation; but they must mean: appointed to salvation as believers, because in a state of faith; and consequently these words, taken into connection with the preceding verses, would say: When God in eternity decided who should be saved and who judged, men did not stand perfectly alike before Him, but as already divided into believers and unbelievers.

And according as He saw them either in faith or in unbelief, He elected or rejected them. Such an understanding of the present passage is demanded both by the words as they stand, and also by the context.

The simple meaning of these apostolic words is the following: You beloved Thessalonians are now in the state of faith. That is, of course, not your work and merrit, but the work of the Holy Ghost only, wrought in you by means of the Gospel which I preached unto you. As believers in the Gospel you have become the possession of Jesus Christ, have been justified from your sins, have been accepted unto life eternal, while all those that do not believe the Gospel have been delivered unto judgment. God has, however, adjudged this salvation to you already from eternity, and not only now in time. And this eternal appointment occurred in just the same way as your acceptance in time. As you were not justified as disbelievers of the truth, but as believers, so you were not elected in eternity as unbelievers, but as believers. For it is God's unalterable decree that only he that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned. True, you were not at the time of your election actually believers; for you were not yet actually in existence. But as certainly as God saw you before you came into existence (and it was then He elected you), so certainly did He see you called by the Gospel and brought to faith by the working of the Holy Ghost. And as such, believers whom He knew beforehand, He has elected you. He hath chosen you from the beginning to salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. — We repeat it: if this passage teaches anything concerning election, then it teaches that the elect have been elected not without faith, but in faith, as believers, in foresight of faith, or, what is the same, for the sake of the merit of Jesus Christ apprehended (in the foreknowledge of God) in faith.

The very same is taught also by the next passage which treats of election, 1 Pet. 1, 1, 2: "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."* With these words St. Peter greets the congregations of Minor Asia, founded for the most part by St. Paul, consisting of Jewish and Gentile Christians,

* Revised Version.

but principally of the latter. He calls the members of these congregations "elect sojourners", and thereby reminds them of the great advantage which they as believing Christians enjoy over those who are without a knowledge of Christ. They are now the elect people of God, whom God through His gracious call has separated from the world and chosen for His possession.

And he says of these "elect sojourners" that they are what they are "according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." They are "elect sojourners", first of all "according to the foreknowledge of God the Father." These words contain a very important qualification of the word "elect." If, in considering the subject of predestination, we follow the leading of our reason, we cannot (as also our Confessions declare) resist the thought: either you are elected — and then things may go as they will, you must be saved anyhow — or: you are not elected — and then you may do what you will, you'll be lost at any rate. But just to encounter such thoughts, the apostle Peter says here, as St. Paul says in Rom. 8, that election has taken place according to the foreknowledge of God. By these words the apostle leads us out of eternity into time and reminds us that God turly knew in eternity what would occur in time, and that election is determined and conditioned by this divine foreknowledge. For the word "foreknowledge" does not mean, as Missouri maintains, "preordination, predestination, fellowship of the elect with God, determined beforehand." As already remarked in the explanation of Rom. 8, that is nothing but an invention, a meaning attributed to the word by Calvin. "Foreknowledge" means simply "to know beforehand." This word is never used in the Holy Scriptures in any other sense, never in the sense of election. Therefore our Confessions want the difference between foreknowledge and predestination to be accurately observed (Mueller, p. 554). It is therefore nothing less than a departure from the Word if any one, out of regard for his own thoughts, would make divine foreknowledge mean predestination. And the whole connection shows that foreknowledge here must mean to know beforehand and can mean nothing else. For what sense do we get out of the passage if we explain foreknowledge and predestination to be one and the same? Peter would then reveal to the Christians, whom he addresses, the astounding fact: Ye are elected according to election. Would not that be perfectly

senseless? Therefore Prof. Stoeckhardt does not like to say, as do others, foreknowledge is election: he prefers to keep these two ideas apart, and thus explains foreknowledge: "predestined fellowship of God with the elect." But that is only playing hide and seek with words. For if God has from eternity placed certain persons into fellowship with Himself, has received them rather than others unto Himself, then He has thereby elected them. Or has He not thereby chosen these out of the mass of the lost and appointed them unto heavenly rest? Even according to Prof. Stoeckhardt's explanation foreknowledge is nothing but election. "To the elect according to the foreknowledge" means then, according to his interpretation: to the elect according to election. But just as certainly as the Holy Ghost does not use such meaningless phrases, so certainly foreknowledge does not mean predestine, but to know beforehand. Chemnitz, one of the chief authors of the Formula of Concord, understands the word even so. He says: "The disposing, moving, operating will does not really belong to a definition of divine foreknowledge, but simply that God knows what is future before it occurs." According to this passage, as well as according to Rom. 8, 29, it is firmly established that election has not taken place according to an absolute will, but according to foreknowledge, and is determined and conditioned by the same.

To what does this foreknowledge of God, according to which election has taken place, refer? What is the object of this foreknowledge? It is self-evident that divine foreknowledge as here used is not unlimited, relating to good and evil, to things necessary and things incidental, but limited by precise reference to a fixed object. The apostle tells us what this object is to which divine foreknowledge relates, when he next presents as a second qualification of election the words: "in sanctification of the Spirit." Sanctification denotes here also, as in 2 Thess. 2, 13, the operation of the Holy Spirit, by virtue of which, through Word and Sacrament, He receives the sinner into the redeeming, saving fellowship of God, advances and preserves him therein, makes him a believer and keeps him as such. In this sanctification of the Spirit, i. e. as persons who through the power of the Holy Ghost have grasped in faith Christ's merit, those, to whom the apostle writes, have been accepted in time as God's peculiar people, as children and heirs. In sanctification of the Spirit, i. e., as true believers, God the Lord has appointed or

elected them in eternity to sonship and heirship, as the apostle here states. And God could do this, because by virtue of His omniscience He saw from eternity not only that they would be born in time as lost sinners, and would be redeemed through Christ, but that they would be baptized, hear the Gospel, and through these means, empowered by the Holy Spirit, would believe in Christ. Already in eternity they appeared before His all-seeing eye as believers, and as such they were elected. Faith, apprehending Christ's merit, was the object to which God's foreknowledge referred, according to which election took place. God did not blindly dash in among men and seize whomever He happened to strike; He has not drawn the line of separation between sinners and sinners — all alike — according to the hidden reasons of a secret will, but He has acted in accord with the principle: "He that believeth on the Son, hath life." Whomever, by virtue of His omniscience, He beheld in this faith He elected; whom not, He rejected. Elected according to the foreknowledge of God in sanctification of the Spirit means essentially nothing but: elected in view of divinely wrought faith. Elected in sanctification of the Spirit, says the apostle, not unto sanctification of the Spirit, therefore not unto faith, not unto the call, as Missouri teaches; for the call and faith belong indeed to sanctification. The Lutheran Church teaches that the second article concerns all men. The Calvinists deny this. In this point Missouri is still Lutheran. But how is it with respect to the third article? The Lutheran allows that this also is for all, the Calvinists, on the other hand, allow it for the elect only. And Missouri? Now it stands on the Lutheran, now on the Calvinistic side; now it still leaves the third article for all men and again not for all, but only for the elect. In so far as Missouri still teaches universal grace, it allows the third article for all; but in so far as the selection of individuals that are infallibly to be saved is placed between the second and the third article, and from this choice is said to proceed a special call, necessarily attaining its object, and a richer grace, unconditionally guaranteeing salvation for these chosen ones according to the free purpose — in so far Missouri does not allow the third article for all, but only for the elect. The apostle Peter knows nothing of such an election unto the call and unto faith, and which stands in open contradiction to the revealed counsel of grace. He recognizes only an election that corresponds perfectly with the

revealed plan of grace, an election in sanctification of the Spirit, i. e. in faith. As God does not save men according to mere pleasure, but according to a certain order, so also He does not elect according to mere pleasure, but according to an appointed order. As He justifies and saves only those who stand in faith, so He has elected only those whom He foreknew as believers. The separation of individuals does not, in the divine mind, precede the sanctification of the Spirit, but follows it. The separation is not made unto sanctification of the Spirit, but in the sanctification the separation is accomplished, i. e. the sanctified, believers, are selected. Missouri may assert ever so stoutly that the Scriptures do not by a single word indicate that faith is to be considered as a presupposition of election; that they know nothing of the foreknowledge of faith as a basis of election — it is not true. As the apostle Paul teaches in Rom. 8, 29, so here Peter also teaches: elect sojourners according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit — thus he teaches in the most emphatic manner an election in view of faith. But the apostle adds yet another qualification to the "elect sojourners." He says that they are elected "unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Therewith the apostle shows what the object and goal of their election is, whereunto God in election has appointed them, namely: unto obedience and unto sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.

Here, according to Missouri's claim, her doctrine of election is expressed in the most emphatic manner. "The apostle hereby teaches," so says "L. u. W.," "with clear, plain words, that we are elected unto faith and unto justification." But where does "unto faith" stand in clear, plain words? Why, some one replies, don't you see the express declaration: "unto obedience"? Yes, surely, but where does it say: "unto faith"? It is amazing how brisk and spry Missouri has become in explaining (laying out) the Scriptures since the new "Reformation" has begun. Paul says 2 Thess. 2, 13: "elected in belief of the truth." But these words are wholly irreconcilable with the Neo-Missourian doctrine of election. In the Minutes of '77 we get this exegesis: "unto obedience to God's Word." Peter says here: elected "unto obedience." But then that explanation does not fit well. Unto faith fits better. Without hesitation, therefore, they say and interpret: unto faith. At one time they change "faith" into obedience, at another time obedience into faith. But is that abiding

by the Word? Or is it not much rather, in a horrifying manner, putting the Holy Ghost to school?

True, they have asserted, in order to support their cause, that when the Scriptures speak of obedience and add nothing else, they mean faith. But that is merely a claim invented for the occasion. The very opposite is the case: When the Scriptures speak of obedience without adding anything else, they mean obedience in general and not only justifying faith as such. Of course faith can also be called obedience, for obedience is cheerful submission to the divine will as revealed in the Word. This will of God is a double one: the holy will, as revealed in the law, and the gracious will announced in the Gospel. In so far, now, as faith submits itself to the gracious will of God revealed in the Gospel, it too is obedience and can likewise be called obedience. And there are really some passages of Holy Scripture, in which faith is called obedience, where faith is actually meant by the word obedience. But where such is the case, the Scriptures expressly indicate it. Thus Paul says, e. g., Rom. 1, 5, that it is his office to establish the obedience of faith, i. e., an obedience that consists in faith; and 2 Cor. 10, 5, he says that he brings into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ (i. e., unto Christ). Furthermore, 1 Pet. 1, 22: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in your obedience to the truth." That faith is understood in these passages is clear. For this is an obedience unto the truth, the Gospel, unto Christ the founder and contents of the Gospel — an obedience that can be nothing but a believing acceptation of the message of salvation. In the first passage it is even stated that this obedience is faith. But why must we in these passages understand obedience to mean faith? Because the Scriptures themselves indicate that they are only speaking of submission to the gracious will revealed in the Gospel. But where the Scriptures do not further particularize, obedience is meant in general, i. e. submission to the whole will of God revealed in the Word; there the whole conduct of a believing, justified child of God is understood, as this is shown in faith and life. And such is the use of the word in our passage. "Elected unto obedience," therefore does not mean, chosen before others unto faith, unto conversion, but it means: appointed unto humble and childlike conduct over against the divine will. The apostle says here essentially the same that Paul says Eph. 1, 4:

God "hath chosen us in Him, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love."

This construction of the text is demanded by the order of thought in the three qualifications by which the apostle limits the word "elect." He has said that election has occurred according to divine foreknowledge, in sanctification of the Spirit, i. e. in the faith wrought by the Holy Ghost. When God elected, He did not behold those, whom He chose, as being in Adam, lost in the sight of the law and knowing nothing of the Gospel, but He beheld them in the sanctification of the Spirit, as united with Christ, as believers, and as believers, not as unbelievers, He elected them. It is this that the apostle expresses concerning the elect in the first two qualifications. When now he proceeds: "unto obedience," he certainly can not mean: You, that have come to faith and that are elect according to the foreknowledge of God, are elected unto this, that ye should believe; the aim of God in your election was that He might make you believers. Yes, if he had said: God has appointed you, who still lie before His eyes in unbelief, unto the obedience of faith, of the gospel, of Christ, then one might give the rendering: God has elected you unto faith. However, to say of those who have been elected as believers, as in the state of faith, that they have been elected so that they should become believers, is altogether senseless. If we do not want to ascribe nonsense to the apostle, we must take his words as they read, namely: you, the believing children of God, are appointed by God unto cheerful and willing submission to His whole will as revealed in Law and Gospel, that you approve yourselves in work and in suffering as His obedient children. That this, and nothing else, is the meaning of the apostle, appears from the fact that he elsewhere uses the word "obedience" in this manner. In the 13th verse of our chapter he admonishes the elect sojourners: "Wherefore, girding up the loins of your mind, be sober and set your hope perfectly on the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ; as children of obedience, not fashioning yourselves according to your former lusts in the time of your ignorance." What does the apostle wish to say in this connection? He desires to say: You Christians have through the Holy Ghost come to faith and have become God's children, being born again unto a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, unto

an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you. Show yourselves in all your life as obedient children, or as "children of obedience," by setting your hope altogether on the grace of God and by no longer living according to the lusts of the flesh. Thus the apostle tells us as clearly as possible what he understands by "obedience"; not faith alone, he does not speak of the former conversion of the sinner through faith, the transplanting of the unregenerate from a state of sin and wrath into a state of faith and of grace, — for he speaks to regenerate, sanctified Christians who have become believers —; but he understands by "obedience" the whole submissive conduct of believers, as justified Christians, over against the divine will, which conduct consists in an exclusive trust in the gracious promises of the Gospel and in a holy walk according to the divine Law. Believing Christians are appointed unto this obedience. That they prove this obedience, this God had in view in their conversion and justification in time, as well as in their election in eternity. True, this obedience embraces not only what we are accustomed to call good works, but also Christian faith, not, however, in so far as that faith is the transplanting of the sinner from a state of sin and of wrath into a state of grace, but only in so far as it constitutes the principal part of a Christian's filial conduct towards God. A man must come to faith through the operation of the Holy Ghost and through Him be justified and regenerated, before we can speak of obedience on the part of man. Filial obedience presupposes acceptance into the filial condition. He that has believed and has thus become a justified and regenerate child of God, should above all approve himself as a child of God in the manner described by Luther in "The Large Catechism": "That the heart know no other trust or confidence than in Him, and do not suffer itself to be torn from Him, but may, for Him, risk and disregard everything upon earth" (Müller, p. 388). In so far faith of course belongs to the obedience which should employ Christians according to the will of God. In so far, but in so far only, Peter here includes faith. — The meaning of the word, the context, and parallel passages all go to prove that the apostle, by the word obedience, does by no means understand converting, justifying faith only, as Missouri would have it, but the whole conduct agreeable to the divine will, as believing Christians are called to manifest it.

Yet Missouri objects that the context does not allow this

construction of obedience. For, the apostle says not only: elected unto obedience, but adds: "unto sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." But sprinkling with Christ's blood denotes justification. In this connection, therefore, obedience can denote nothing but faith embracing Christ's merit, by which we are justified. Now it is undoubtedly true that sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ means: justification, deliverance from the guilt and the punishment of sin on the basis of the merit of Jesus Christ, absolution. From the word itself it in no way appears that the first absolution, which is bestowed upon the sinner just converted from his evil ways, is meant. It can just as well be that absolution which is daily granted unto all Christians that have long been in a state of grace. Absolution, deliverance from the guilt and the punishment of sin on the basis of the merit of Jesus Christ, can mean this, as well as the other. If by the absolution here under consideration, the first absolution must necessarily be understood, the absolution, namely, that is granted to the godless man newly converted and whereby he, formerly subject to wrath and judgment, is received into the state of God's pardoned children: then of course justifying faith might be understood by obedience. But this is not the case. Far from understanding the expression: sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, to mean the justification of a formerly unconverted sinner, we can not at all, according to the context, find this meaning in the passage. The apostle sets forth this sprinkling with Christ's blood as an end of the election accomplished according to the foreknowledge of God in the sanctification of the Spirit. He does not speak of people who up to that time had lain in unbelief under divine wrath, but of such as were already, through the working of God the Holy Ghost, believing Christians, at least according to God's foresight, and who, in the moment of eternity when their election occurred, stood in grace and sonship and as sprinkled with Christ's blood before the all-seeing eye of God. It is impossible, therefore, to find here a discussion of reception into the state of grace and sonship, but only of preservation in this state; but this preservation occurs through obedience, above all, however, through continued sprinkling with the blood of Christ, daily forgiveness of sin. For since believing Christians never render perfect obedience, but daily sin much and often, and hence daily merit God's wrath and condemnation, they there-

fore need daily purification through Christ's blood, if they would remain God's children and heirs. It is then by no means necessary that the word obedience, by reason of its being connected with sprinkling, etc., must denote: the faith that grasps Christ's merit, that translates from a state of wrath into a state of grace. Peter has no knowledge of such a thing as the Missourian election unto faith. By both words, obedience and sprinkling, the apostle describes the state of God's children on earth, which state embraces willing submission to God's will and then also daily cleansing from sin through the blood of Christ. Not unto faith, unto conversion, unto the call, as Missouri says, but unto obedience and daily repentance believing Christians are appointed. At this God aimed in election: they are elect "according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

And now, to sum up everything briefly, the simple meaning of the apostle's words is as follows. You, dear believing Christians, are preferred above all other men, as Israel was formerly chosen above the heathen, namely a chosen generation. Through sanctification of the Spirit God has separated you from the lost world and received you as His dear children and as heirs of heaven. And as God now in time really executes this plan, so did He in eternity resolve to do. God has from eternity appointed and elected you to be His children. God has, of course, not done this blindly, as though He had at random thrust His hand into the mass of humanity and accidentally seized on you. He has not dealt according to the bare, absolute purpose of His secret will, as though He had picked out certain persons in preference to others, from among a mass of sinners all alike and undistinguished from one another, to be His favorites, and appointed these to faith and upon the way of faith unto salvation, and had not so done with regard to others simply — because He willed it so. No! God has elected you according to His foreknowledge in sanctification of the Spirit. As you have now in faith become God's children, so God from eternity has foreknown you as believers in Christ, and as such, as believers, He has elected you. As you did not become God's children without faith, before faith came, so you were not elected (according to God's foreknowledge) without faith, as unbelievers. And as you now, as Christians, are called to live in obedience to God's will and in daily repent-

ance, so you have been appointed thereto from eternity. God has elected you unto obedience and unto sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ. If you in this way make your calling and election sure, you will certainly receive the end of faith — your soul's salvation. — Far from contradicting St. Paul, and Christ Himself, by preaching the Missouri doctrine of a selection of certain individuals unto the call, unto conversion, unto faith, and this according to a free, uncircumscribed purpose of the divine will, he holds in perfect harmony with all other passages of Scripture that God has not elected according to an absolute purpose, not according to a secret plan, not without faith, not unto faith, but in faith, in foresight of faith, for the sake of the merit of Jesus Christ apprehended (according to the divine foreknowledge) in faith.

Let us finally glance once more at all the scriptural statements cited. In Matt. 22, 1-14, we learned that the marriage garment, the merit of Jesus Christ embraced in faith, decides and has decided concerning acceptance and rejection in time and in eternity. In Rom. 8, 28-30, we heard that the decree of election is not totally or essentially different from the universal decree of salvation, but is included in the universal decree of salvation, which decree makes salvation conditional on the presence of faith; and that therefore the eternal appointment of certain persons to glorification is conditioned by the foresight of faith. In Eph. 1, 3-5, we were shown that as the blessing of God is dispensed in time, so also in eternity election took place in Christ, in believing fellowship with Christ. 2 Thess. 2, 13, and 1 Pet. 1, 2, finally, taught us that election was not unto sanctification and unto faith, but in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth. And in the last passage we heard again, as in Rom. 8, that election was determined by the foresight of faith. We nowhere found the slightest support for an election unto faith and according to God's mere pleasure. Only through forced distortions of the words of Scripture was it possible for the Missourians to introduce their Calvinizing doctrine of election into Holy Writ. If we furthermore add that the Scriptures expressly state that God has elected believers, as we see in James 2, 5: "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith?" that they affirm Heb. 11, 6: "But without faith it is impossible to please" God, thus proving that God could not elect without regard to faith: then

we may safely assert that he scriptural proof for the doctrine, that God did not elect according to a free purpose, but in foreknowledge of faith, has been furnished as powerfully and irresistibly as it can be furnished for any doctrine. The words: "God has elected in foresight of faith" do not appear in just so many letters and syllables in the passages quoted. But if a doctrine can only then be shown to be scriptural when the very words employed by the church are found in the Bible, then the Confessions of the church have a poor chance. Where do we find in Scripture the exact words: God is one in essence and triune in persons? that the divine nature in Christ has communicated its attributes to the human nature? that the church, properly speaking, is invisible? that the ministerial office is conveyed through the call? that Christ's body and blood are sacramentally united with the bread and the wine in the Holy Supper? Yes, where in the Bible do we find the Lutheran Church's phrase "In, with and under" in exactly these same words? Nowhere. If the doctrine of the eternal appointment of certain individuals to salvation in foresight of faith were proved to be unscriptural, because the identical words and syllables are not discernible in the Bible, then these other doctrines can not be established as scriptural, for the individual words and phrases in which the church has expressed them are just as little, as in the former case, to be found in the Bible. Only then to recognize a doctrine as scriptural when the ecclesiastic and theological mode of expression can be produced letter for letter and syllable for syllable from the Scriptures, is fanaticism, yea — madness. We are not so much concerned, in the reproduction of a doctrine, about the presentation of it in the identical original words, as we are concerned about the matter, the substance that is contained in the ecclesiastic and theological expression. The substance handled in the present doctrinal controversy, namely that God has not elected according to His mere pleasure, but in view of Jesus Christ's merit embraced in faith — is taught as clearly and plainly in the passages quoted, as the real presence of the body and the blood of Christ is taught in the texts treating of the Lord's Supper. For, truly, the words: "This is my body, this is my blood," do not more plainly express the "In, with and under," than the words: "God has elected us in Christ, in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth according to fore-

knowledge" express election in foresight of faith. The rejection of the latter doctrine on the part of Missouri is therefore not less a rejection of divine truth, than the rejection of the true presence of Christ's body and blood, on the part of the Reformed. Hence, if Missouri asserts that the Scriptures know nothing about the foresight of faith as the basis of election, and that the doctrine, that God first foreknew faith and then appointed just those unto salvation whom He foreknew as believers, contradicts clear Scripture-teaching, then that assertion is just as little true as when the Reformed maintain that the Scripture knows nothing of the true presence in the Holy Supper and of an oral reception of the body and the blood. And as little as a Lutheran Christian will allow himself to be led astray by the talk of the Reformed — for the Lutheran clings to the simple word: this is my body, this is my blood — so little will a sound Lutheran Christian permit himself, by the talk of Missouri, to be led astray regarding the truth that God has elected in view of faith. For the text: "God has elected in Christ, in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth, according to foreknowledge," is "too powerful, and cannot be torn out of his heart and head by mere words." An election unto faith, according to a mere, absolute purpose, an election that picks out from among the mass of sinners, all alike, certain individuals without any reference to faith or non-faith, so that now these elect "shall and must" come unto faith, remain in faith, and be saved, "and besides them none else," — such an election the Scriptures do not recognize. This doctrine of election does not only contradict the clear scriptural teaching of election, by impudently and flatly denying the truth set forth in the texts that treat of election, but it also fundamentally overthrows the whole Gospel. Therefore, for the one reason, that we hold firmly to the clear Word of God and will let no human speculations be foisted upon us as God's Word; and above all, because we would retain the comfort of the Gospel, — we reject with our fathers this Calvinizing doctrine of modern Missouri, and we hold with our fathers, on the strength of the divine Word, that in election Christ's merit is considered not merely as obtained for us, but also as apprehended by us, that God has elected in view of faith.

As the doctrine, that God has elected in view of faith, is clearly and plainly declared in those passages of Scripture that

expressly treat of election, so is it also demanded and confirmed by the analogy of faith. And this is the second proof that we wish to adduce, in a few words. By the analogy of faith we understand the connexion, the agreement, the harmonious relation, in which the articles of faith stand to each other. God has not revealed to us an unconnected, contradictory faith. The different articles of faith are not like a variegated quilt that is patched together out of different stuffs and out of rags representing all possible colors. No; the different articles of our faith are all most intimately related to each other and are in wonderful consonance with each other. They are like a work of art, whose individual parts form a harmonious whole. The apostle writes to this effect, Rom. 12, 6: "Whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith." In thus warning us most earnestly against would-be interpretations of Scripture which violate the unity of faith, the apostle at the same time says that all articles of faith really agree, the one with the other. Every doctrine purporting to be of scriptural authority, if destructive of this connexion, is necessarily a false doctrine, even if one should seek to prove it with demonstrations ever so glittering from one or the other passage of Scripture, or from so-called dogmas. On the other hand, every doctrine that is not only expressly taught in passages of Scripture, but is also demanded and confirmed by the analogy of faith, must of necessity be divine truth. If the harmony of faith demands and confirms the doctrine, that the selection and appointment of those persons who shall infallibly be saved occurred for the sake of Jesus Christ's merit apprehended in faith, then this doctrine must be the truth, and the opposite must be false doctrine. That the analogy of faith really both demands and confirms this doctrine is undeniable.

If we question the Gospel as to what decides the justification and the salvation of one sinner in preference to another, we find the answer recorded upon every page of the Sacred Book: Faith alone. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." — "And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life." — "He that believeth on Him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already." In these and innumerable passages we are most plainly informed who shall be saved and who not. God

indeed, as the Gospel tells us, desires the salvation of all men; is as earnest, too, in this desire with regard to the one as with regard to the other. His love embraces all with equal ardor. God has not, at the outset, preferred any one or overlooked any one. But God, as the Holy One, certainly can not and will not under any and every condition declare sinners to be His dear children and save them. For the sake of divine holiness and righteousness sin had first to be expiated by making a sufficient offering, and a perfect righteousness had to be acquired, before the sinner's forgiveness and salvation could be granted; so also for the sake of the same holiness and righteousness the acquired righteousness of Jesus Christ must first become the sinner's own before he can be declared just before God's judgment bar and be saved. The only possible means of appropriating the merit of Jesus Christ is faith. Therefore God in His eternal counsel decreed that He would save sinners solely through faith in His Son Jesus Christ. True, God Himself must work this faith; but He wants to create it in all, if they do not render His work impossible by wilful resistance, for God will certainly use no force. Although He offers the sinner all necessary power in order to believe, He still allows him the freedom of wilfully thrusting His grace away; and those who do so, God can not justify and save, however willing He would be to save them. Though Christ has died for them, and His merit has time and again with all earnestness been offered to them — as long as they do not actually embrace in faith Christ's merit, they stand before God as unrighteous, still therefore under the law and its curse, and hence can not be justified and saved. What, according to the Gospel, decides that, of the sinners all alike lost in Adam, all alike redeemed in Christ, a certain number is chosen, justified, saved, and the others, not chosen, are delivered unto destruction? Not a man's own works and merits, but just as little an unconditioned purpose of the free pleasure of God; this alone has decided: the merit of Jesus Christ apprehended in faith — nothing else. Therefore the Apology says: "And this faith makes a distinction between those by whom salvation is attained, and those by whom it is not attained. Faith makes the distinction between the worthy and the unworthy, because eternal life has been promised to the justified; and faith justifies, if we through faith grasp the promise" (Muel. p. 144).

Justified and saved by grace alone, for Christ's sake, through faith — that is the kernel of the whole Gospel. This is the fundamental article of the Christian faith and upholds the entire system of Christian doctrine as well as the church itself.

What follows from this statement of the doctrine of election? If the articles of faith must stand in agreement with each other, if, above all, they must be in accord with the chief and fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, the doctrine that supports everything else, then it follows necessarily that also in eternal election God took into account the merit of Jesus Christ apprehended in faith, that He elected in view of faith. If election is the final and unchangeable decree of God, in which He has drawn a sharp distinction between sinner and sinner, and has once for all settled who shall be saved and who not; furthermore, if this decision depends, according to the Gospel, on nothing (whether it be human merit or an absolute divine decree) but faith, i. e., on the apprehended merit of Jesus Christ; moreover, if there are not two different contradictory wills of God respecting salvation, a revealed will and a hidden will — then, already in eternity, Jesus Christ's merit apprehended in faith must have decided whether a man should be appointed to the certain attainment of salvation or not, and what men should be thus appointed. God must have looked into the future, and those, whom He saw among the coming sons of men as believing through the power of His Word and as sharing in the merit of Christ, He, for the sake of the merit of Jesus Christ grasped in faith, sundered out from the mass of unbelievers and appointed them unto salvation; whilst all the others, whose persistent unbelief He foresaw, He rejected on account of their unbelief. Election must be founded upon Christ's merit; for Christ's merit is the foundation of all salvation. Here, just as little as in justification and salvation, can Christ's merit be considered with respect to its acquirement alone. For we speak here of the separation of certain individuals from the mass of sinners, as well as of an appointment of these chosen ones to the infallible attainment of salvation. But this separative appointment could not possibly have its ground in the merit of Christ considered with respect to its acquisition alone. Christ's merit has been acquired for all, for those who weep in hell no less than for those who rejoice in heaven. If, in election, this only were considered, that Christ died for all, then all would be elected and all would be saved. But now not all,

only a few of the redeemed are elected. If election took place for Christ's sake just as well as the justification of a sinner took place for Christ's sake, then, as in justification, so in election, the appropriation of Christ's merit, occurring through faith, must have been taken into account. As in justification the merit of Jesus Christ accepted in faith decided who should be justified, so also in eternal election the merit of Jesus Christ accepted in faith decided which persons should be saved and which should not. This follows necessarily from the analogy of faith. Thus the doctrine of election fits harmoniously into the whole body of the articles of faith. Thus there exists not the slightest contradiction between this doctrine and the fundamental doctrine of the Gospel: "Out of grace, for Christ's sake through faith." The analogy of faith demands and confirms the doctrine, that God has elected in view of faith.

But how about the doctrine of election which Missouri at present teaches? Does it stand in perfect harmony with the chief and fundamental doctrine of the Gospel? Not in the least; on the contrary, it contradicts this doctrine directly. For what does Missouri teach? She teaches — to repeat once more and briefly — the following: "Predestination (election) is the actual and eternal separation of certain individuals from the multitude of those who are not to be saved" ("L. u. W.," 24, p. 353). This separation is not founded upon the merit of Jesus Christ accepted in faith, is not accomplished according to the rule: He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned, but is wholly independent of this appropriation of Christ's merit. From the multitude of men, all alike in unbelief and under the curse of the Law, God separates certain persons who most certainly shall and must be saved, others He leaves behind, although He could have elected and saved these just as easily as the rest. God indeed gives to all men a certain grace; but for the elect He has provided a "more abundant" grace. While, therefore, the non-elect may despise their call, God necessarily carries out His will in the case of the elect, in that He overcomes the most wilful resistance, so that they must come to faith. While also many non-elect temporarily believe, but lose their faith again, the elect must persevere in faith, must, in case they for a time fall away, become repentant again by virtue of the grace of election. While eternal life is promised to all believers on condition that they persevere, perseverance and salvation are guaranteed

for the elect by virtue of their election. Why God acts differently in these two instances, and according to what rule He acts, is hidden from us; only this is certain, that the merit of Christ accepted in faith, has not been the rule. The work of election has been done without any regard to man's conduct; it is based only upon the secret will of God. The Minutes of '77 say: "If we were to say to our God: Why hast Thou elected me? He would answer: Because I so willed. If we would ask further: Why didst Thou will it? He would reply: It was even the pleasure of my will" (p. 26). In the Minutes of '79 we read: "If God grants the grace of perseverance to the elect, the non-elect have no right to accuse God for not bestowing on them this rich measure of grace; for God does not owe us a special, greater measure of this grace. To him that would thus complain, God would speak this word of Scripture: 'Have I not power to do with My own what I will?' — Parents act in a similar manner. Sometimes a parent is more kind to one child than to another, because the one is more obedient and gives more joy than the other; to the latter the parent gives food and drink and tries in various ways to please it; but to the former the parent manifests, in this or in that direction, more love than to the latter. Even so does God deal with us; only, He does not even ask whether we have followed Him or not; but He acts as He pleases" (p. 38).

What? Does this doctrine of Missouri agree with the plan of salvation revealed in the Gospel? Does it not rather contradict the Gospel directly? The Gospel says: Faith alone — nothing else — decides whether a man will be saved, for without faith man is outside of Christ and still remains under the curse. God can not save him in an unbelieving state. Only where there is forgiveness of sin, are life and salvation. Man has forgiveness of sin only when he embraces in faith the merit of Christ. Therefore man must first have attained the forgiveness of sins through faith, before God can save him. The Gospel teaches this. And what does the Missourian doctrine of election teach? It says: Not faith, but only the free pleasure of God has finally decided the question, what sinners rather than others shall be saved. When God saw them all lying in the same ruin, in the same unbelief, He chose, according to His free purpose, whom He would, and promised them eternal life as an inalienable possession. He did not at all inquire concerning the apprehended merit of Jesus Christ; this did not at all decide,

but only the free pleasure of God. God did not make any inquiry concerning faith, but only followed His own will. Truly, that is not the old gospel which prophets and apostles preached, but a new one, wholly different — a cancellation of the entire Gospel.

This becomes still clearer, when we consider what the word choose, or elect really means. To elect means simply to take out of a number of people certain persons whom one prefers, to do this for an appointed purpose, and to abandon the rest. A selection, where all are taken, where a few at least are not left, would be no selection. We must not represent the matter as though one first of all picks out which he wills without any reference to the rest, and, when this has been done, for some reason or other passes by the rest. On the contrary, in the act of choosing certain persons, the rest are passed by. The choosing of the one is the abandoning of the other. The very thing which constitutes the act of election, is this, that certain individuals are chosen for a certain purpose and the rest are omitted. Thence follows also that one and the same law must decide the choosing and the not-choosing. Because this constitutes election, that I take some whom I prefer, and omit others whom I will not have, I can not choose according to one rule and omit to choose according to another rule, but with regard to both one and the same rule must decide. At the last day Christ the Lord will make a strict difference between those who shall be saved and those that shall not be saved. He there chooses, as He has the right to do, a number of persons out of the mass of humanity, and in doing so excludes the others from this election. And this takes place according to one and the same rule. Belief and unbelief decide. Where He finds faith, He saves: where He finds unbelief, He rejects. But if the judge of the world would at the last day make no inquiry concerning faith, if the apprehended merit of Christ would not decide who are to be saved, but only the free purpose of a hidden will; then the unbelief of the others would not be the cause of their rejection, but this rejection would be based on the free pleasure of God, who without inquiring about anything, accepts whom He wills and rejects whom He wills. The same thing is true in the eternal decree of election with respect to certain individuals, which is nothing but the judgment in eternity. There also the same law must have decided the acceptance and the non-acceptance. If God did not take faith into account, then He did not take unbelief into

account. If the free pleasure of the divine will alone settled the question, which sinners shall infallibly be saved, then also this divine free pleasure alone decided which shall not be saved. The former, as well as the latter, were unbelievers — and yet as such they were elected. If in their case unbelief was no hindrance to election, then in the case of the non-elect unbelief could not have hindered election. Had God elected them, their unbelief would have melted away as the snow melts beneath the sun's warmth. Why God has not elected them is a hidden mystery of His will. As election, so non-election is based on the secret hidden purpose of the divine will. Between acceptance and rejection the decision is rendered by the sovereign pleasure of the divine will alone. When Missouri rejects election in view of faith and teaches us an election, according to God's free pleasure, an election of unbelievers, she puts the cause of the non-election and final destruction of so many — for only the elect shall and must be saved, and beside them none else — in the secret will of God. That such a doctrine is in open contradiction to the Gospel, one does not need to prove to a Lutheran Christian. True, Missouri as a whole has not yet expressly and openly advanced the statement, that non-election also is based on God's secret will; but this proposition is the necessary conclusion of the doctrine that God has elected according to His mere pleasure without foresight of faith. By such a doctrine the universal gracious will of God, even if one does not in so many words say it, is really undermined and overthrown, yea, is made a lie. For if God, as Missouri says, actually picked out from among the mass of humanity all alike in sin, a certain number for Himself, and resolved through the bestowal of a richer measure of grace to bring them to faith, to preserve them therein and to save them and none else, although He could just as easily have saved the rest; then the revealed will of grace is a mere pretence. And if God's mere pleasure decides who shall be saved and who shall not, then wilful resistance, since God removes this in the case of the elect, is not the cause of non-election, but the cause is found in God's will. One may call these the deductions of reason, but that does not in the least change the matter. These are necessary conclusions from the teaching of Missouri. In necessary conclusions the subject itself appears. If the necessary consequences of a certain doctrine are false, then the doctrine itself is necessarily false. From the proposition: God has,

without any regard to faith, but merely according to His free pleasure, appointed a certain number of persons to salvation and has omitted others, this necessarily follows: God has, without any regard to their unbelief, merely according to His free pleasure, passed over a great number of men and has not given them the grace of election which decides everything. Thus, behind the universal gracious will there stands still another will, the will of election, referring from the very outset to a few only. These are the necessary consequences of the Missourian doctrine of election, and they have already, in part, been drawn by some. But for this reason the Missourian doctrine of election is necessarily a false doctrine, an open contradiction of the Gospel — a cancellation of the entire Gospel.

All this is not in the least changed by saying: we do not exclude faith from election, we teach that God has elected nobody whom He has not elected unto faith; He has resolved to elect through faith. The Missourian doctrine of election is not freed by these and similar remarks from its opposition to the Gospel, even if some are thus deceived, for this is saying no more than the Calvinists have always said. In that sense no one, not even the grossest Calvinist, has excluded faith from election. The Calvinists have always said that God would save His elect through faith only; therefore He elected and appointed them to faith also. They allowed faith a place in the decree of election in so far as the object and effect of election were considered. What they rejected was, that God in election itself had any regard to faith; just so Missouri. But just as certainly as the Calvinists taught an absolute, unconditioned election, dependent only on God's will, notwithstanding that they allowed faith to be at the same time an appointed means for the execution of election; so certainly Missouri also teaches an unconditioned election, however much she may assure us that God has resolved to save the elect through faith. Just as do the Calvinists, so also Missouri takes faith into account only as a means of carrying out the decree of election. But that is not at all the question about which we are here concerned. The question is this: Was regard had to faith in election itself? has faith, has the appropriation of Christ's merit something to do with the separation itself of individuals? Did election occur in view of the merit of Christ and of true faith in Christ so that God elected those whom He did elect because He saw from eternity that they through His grace would

believe in Christ? and did He reject the others because He foresaw their wilful, persevering resistance? Or did God out of a mere free purpose elect certain ones and resolve to give them faith, but reject the others and omit the resolve to give them faith? That is the question under discussion. And in answer to this question Missouri says with the Calvinists: No, the election of individuals did not occur in view of faith. The appropriation of Christ's merit did not decide the question, who should infallibly be saved; but only God's free pleasure determined the matter. As the Lord of all, who can do what He wills, God has chosen out a number of persons for Himself, whom He would, and has appointed these in preference to the rest unto faith, and in such a manner that they must come to faith and must through faith be saved. According to Missourian teaching faith is included in election somewhat as good works are included in justification. As these have no place in justification, when the question is as to what sinner shall be justified in preference to others—for faith alone decides that — (although the justified are certainly appointed to live, not in sins, but in sanctification); so also in election faith has no decisive voice whatever when the question is, what sinners in preference to others shall be appointed unto eternal life, its bearing being restricted to this that the elect are appointed to be saved through faith alone. But as the works following justification really have nothing to do with justification itself, but are only its necessary fruit and effect: so also faith, according to Missourian teaching, has nothing to do in election itself, but is only the fruit and effect of election. And it is a deceitful diversion when Missouri claims also to teach an election through faith. No; Missouri does not teach that. She teaches with the Calvinists an election according to God's free pleasure without regard to faith, an election unto faith, not in faith. In contradiction to the Gospel Missouri dismisses faith from election proper; for her, as for the Calvinists, faith is only the means for executing the unconditioned decree of election.

If the Missourian doctrine of election were the truth, no preacher could say to his hearers: "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you shall be saved: your salvation depends on whether you believe." For then there would be, in addition to the revealed gracious will, still an altogether different will of God. And whilst the revealed will promises to all salvation on the condition of faith, God the Lord would, in His secret will, have appointed

unconditionally only a certain few from the mass of humanity, all alike in sin, unto faith and salvation. These only would come to faith, at least to persevering faith, and would be brought thereto by virtue of the mystery of election impending over them, the others would not be brought thereto, because they were not elected. It was not the revealed will of grace that saved, but only the secret will of election, which unconditionally selected certain persons and in the case of these necessarily accomplished its purpose. Beside these none could and should be saved. Then, however, this secret will alone would be decisive, on it alone would depend whether a man should be saved or not. How could I as a preacher, according to Missourian teaching direct my hearers to the revealed will, since, in obedience to this type of teaching, I should still be forced to say: "Indeed, behind this revealed will there is still another, and this latter is not for all, is not executed according to the rule of the revealed Gospel, but according to hidden reasons, and this is really the only decisive will — the will that decides everything. — We can point our people to the revealed will; for according to our teaching there is but one saving will of God, and that is the one revealed in the Gospel. A Missouri preacher, however, who really understands his doctrine, can not do this. He can really say only this: You are one of those whom God has elected, or: You are not one of them. When a Missouri pastor absolves a man, and the man asks: "Will I certainly be saved?" according to Missourian doctrine he must answer: "Yes, if you are elected, not otherwise." A true Lutheran pastor on the other hand would answer him: "Yes, if you believe — and that you can know — you will certainly be saved." And he can say this to all alike. According to Missourian teaching he could not do so. He would have to say: "If you are not elected, I can not help you, nor can God's Word — and God does not want to help you. If you are elected, yes — then there is help for you." But who will tell a distressed person with absolute certainty whether he is elected or not? Yet if one cannot absolutely assure him of this, how shall one comfort him? — We can, it is true, give him no sign and seal that God in eternity has irrevocably appointed him to salvation; but in our doctrine this is not necessary, for, according to our teaching, there is no other saving will of God besides the one revealed in the Gospel; accordingly the revealed saving will is

also the will of election, since from the beginning this is for all, and is accomplished according to one and the same rule. We can, therefore, confidently say to troubled hearts: "Behold, here is the Gospel, here is your baptism, here the absolution, here the Holy Supper: believe these, and you will infallibly be saved. God Himself has promised this to you in His Word and He will also faithfully keep this promise; He will not lie, God's will is here revealed to you, and behind this will there is no other. Missouri pastors indeed still continue to preach in the same way; but by so doing they really deny their doctrine of election, yea, they condemn themselves. They may direct their hearers ever so much and ever so often to the universal gracious will, but if the hearers have really comprehended Missouri's doctrine of election, they will not be able to free themselves of the thought: "Yes, that is all very beautiful; but behind this revealed will of God there is yet a hidden will, altogether different from the other, intended for a few only, absolutely accomplishing its purpose, and this alone decides everything. If I am not appointed to salvation according to this secret will of election, 'I may hear God's Word with ever so much diligence, be absolved, go to the Lord's Supper, everything — everything is in vain.'" Such thoughts, according to Missouri's teaching, can not fail to appear. For if there is really such a secret, all-deciding will of election, altogether differing from the universal gracious will — what does it help us to close our eyes against it! You may seek to cover it ever so carefully with the veil of mystery, if you do not want to deceive yourself, you will never find rest in this doctrine. Men carnally secure may indeed content themselves. Enthusiasts may imagine that they must certainly be the favored ones picked out according to the concealed will; but sober Christians, really desirous of salvation, must fall into doubt, if they have rightly grasped this doctrine. Missouri claims to make men quite certain of their salvation by her doctrine of election, but in fact she thereby robs the Christian of all comfort. Despair or security, these are the fruits of the Missourian election doctrine. But this characterizes it sufficiently as a false doctrine, opposed to the Gospel.

APPENDIX.

The undersigned endeavors to present herewith, in compliance with the desire of some of his brethren, a short history of the present controversy. In furnishing the accompanying statement, the writer considers it necessary to answer first of all the question: Which of the two now opposing doctrines was formerly the doctrine of the Missouri Synod? Which of the two parties has departed from its former position and has sought to introduce something new? This question might seem superfluous; for even if the synod referred to formerly held the doctrine which she now rejects, and which we defend, this would not prove that we, in our present opposition, are right. It might be that all of us were formerly alike in error. In that case it would be entirely right for the Missouri Synod to renounce its error, and on our part it would be wrong to oppose such a step. The principal question is and always remains this: Which side has the divine truth now? Yes, that is and remains the great question. Those of Missouri, however, declare with great emphasis that they ever held the doctrine which they now hold. Dr. Walther calls the assertion, that they formerly taught a different doctrine of election from that which they teach at present, a "gross falsehood," which has been "spread from a certain quarter." Dr. W. says this with especial reference to himself. In Chicago, however, he denied just as emphatically, that the doctrine of an election in foresight of faith had been the teaching of the Synod, consequently, this is what he refers to as a gross falsehood. From the beginning he has been very liberal in charging others with "lies," "falsehoods," etc. Let us see on which side the "lie" and the "falsehood" are in the present case.

In the "Lutheraner" of the year 1846, p. 93, we find a communication from the pen of Pastor Schieferdecker, in which the following is presented as the Calvinistic doctrine of election:

That God "according to an unconditional decree elected some to life and condemned some to death, in which decree the conduct of men, and also faith, was in no wise taken into account."

This is what the "Lutheraner" at that time called Calvinistic. We still call it so.

In "Lehre und Wehre," 1855, p. 234, we find theses on the doctrine of election by Dr. Sihler. The first of these reads: "Election is an act of God, wherein, before the foundation of the world, in eternity, He resolved according to the purpose of His will, for Christ's sake, and for the praise of His glorious grace, to save eternally all those whose persevering faith in Christ He foresaw."

Dr. Sihler has now, alas, retracted this thesis; see "Lehre und Wehre," 1881, p. 58. But this retraction is an irrefutable proof that these gentlemen now occupy a different position from that of 25 years ago.

"Lehre und Wehre," 1856, contains a very long article by President Fürbringer. Here, for example, we read: "Before time began God decreed to save through Christ Jesus, His Son, those who were lost and condemned through Adam's fall. And inasmuch as it was not hidden from Him, whose eyes saw us before He made us, which persons would acknowledge His Savior and believe in Him to the end, He resolved to bring them into an existence in which His gracious will should be glorified in them.. But if God (who so determined, and who foreknew because He had resolved to impart) foreknew them as creatures who would be saved through faith, He thereby also predestinated them, as persons who will not be cast away, in whom the counsel of salvation will be realized, unto the attainment of everything necessary for salvation; and these are therefore called according to the purpose. Rom. 8, 28," etc.

This quotation shows in what respect one may speak in an entirely orthodox manner of a predestination "unto the attainment of everything necessary for salvation. The foresight of persevering faith was most clearly presupposed. We have already seen that Dr. W. makes essentially the same explanation in his Postil.

Pres. Fürbringer continues, p. 321: "We are quite logically forced by the foregoing remarks to the question: Is the eternal election of God a cause of the salvation to believers so that this election, first of all, creates faith? We must first of all hold fast that election, to begin with, is not the foundation, nor the means, nor the condition of salvation; for these are Christ, His Gospel,

and the faith it works. In the second place, election is also not the cause of our faith so that faith would be the effect of election; for the Word works faith. But because God's election appoints or ordains beforehand unto salvation His own, whom He knows, therefore it is indeed the cause that works their salvation in so far, as all things in the time of grace must arrange themselves accordingly and serve for this end. It is the cause working to the end that foreseen faith, and all that flows from faith, attain reality by means of the Word coming to us and experienced efficaciously by all who hear it. This is the point of difference which separates the pure doctrine from the Reformed-particularistic doctrine; namely that the power of the divine Word for conversion and regeneration does not require predestination as a presupposition," etc.

Faith, then, is not the effect of election; for the power of the divine Word to convert men does not rest upon predestination as a presupposition, i. e., does not flow from it, as Missouri now maintains, declaring us to be synergists because we deny it. Pres. F., however, tells us that this is the very point of difference between Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrine. He has, therefore, in advance declared the present doctrine of Missouri to be Reformed-particularistic, i. e., Calvinistic! And everybody knows that we make the same declaration still. Whether Pres. F. has hit the exact sense of § 8, Art. XI, of the Formula of Concord, is another question. For there election is not called a cause of our salvation and of what pertains thereto "in so far," etc., but it is simply termed a cause. He has also overlooked the fact, that the Form. Conc. embraces in the idea of "Election or predestination," "i. e. God's appointment to salvation," eight eternal decrees, in the first seven of which God "decreed" salvation itself and "what pertains thereto," but in the eighth, "that those whom He has elected, called and justified" He would also save. If, as does the Form. Conc., we understand by "Election or Predestination, i: e. by God's appointment unto salvation," both the appointment of the whole salvation and the appointment of the persons who really obtain salvation, then we can, yea we must without limitation say, this election, this appointment of God is a cause, and we dare not limit the word cause by "in so far," as Pres. F. does. Still less dare we, as Dr. W. does, call election a cause, namely one beside other causes, viz. Christ, God's grace, etc. This subter-

fuge of Dr. W.'s is, evidently so unchristian that it is inconceivable how he could so speak. A cause of our salvation besides Christ, besides God's grace!! This gross distortion of § 8 is shown to be such, beyond a doubt, by language used in the paragraph. Election is, "from the gracious will and pleasure of God in Christ Jesus, a cause." The Latin text likewise shows that the words "a cause" are not to mean "a cause beside others"; also by election "causa est, quae," etc. According to Dr. W.'s interpretation it would have to read: una causarum, one of the causes, or causa aliqua. In Acts 2, 36, we read: Dass Gott diesen Jesum zu "einem Herrn und Christ gemacht hat." According to Dr. W.'s exegesis that would have to read: "zu einem Herrn und Christ, nämlich neben andern Herren und Christussen." This is the way in which the gentlemen in St. Louis handle the words of the Confessions, and then call all those apostate who do not consent to such work! If only we pay attention to all that the Form. Conc. embraces in this "appointment of God unto salvation, we can and must say with the Form.: This appointment is a cause of our salvation and of what pertains thereto, also of faith, for it constitutes the summary of all causes and all means, as the eight decrees show.

If, however, we speak, as do our dogmaticians and as Pres. Fürbringer evidently does, only of the eighth decree, the final appointment of individuals to eternal life, then we cannot and dare not say that predestination is a cause of faith; for, as Pres. F. rightly says: "The Word creates faith;" and the Word is treated in the second and third decrees, not in the eighth. The eighth presupposes the Word, justification (and thus also faith), as is clearly shown by the words: "Those whom He has elected, called and justified," etc. Furthermore, when we, as do the dogmaticians and Pres. F., speak of the predestination of persons, that is of the eighth decree alone, we dare not say: "The power of the Word presupposes predestination;" then we must say with Pres. F. that it is Reformed-particularistic (Calvinizing) doctrine to teach: Election is a "cause of our faith, in so far as faith is an effect of election." The eighth decree presupposes all the others; they do not presuppose it; as the St. Louis men have already expressly declared, that we must conceive of the election of individuals as belonging between the first and the second decree!

Well, Pres. F. speaks of election in the sense of the dogmaticians, and firmly holds that election occurred in view of faith. That this agrees with the Form. of Conc. he proves as follows: "From all this we conclude at least that believers also were ordained as such from eternity and in consideration of their foreknown persevering faith were elected, not because they believe, but in view of faith; certainly, however, on account of the divine mercy and the merit of Christ, whose expiatory death dare not be limited by election, being in reality the ground of election. Therefore the C. F. rightly says: 'And in so far a Christian should appropriate the article of God's eternal election. . . . Who has resolved in His eternal plan that He will save none except those that acknowledge His Christ and truly believe in Him.' The Form. Conc. draws its election from the purpose to save only those who perseveringly believe; but this connecting of the two is conceivable only as being brought about by foreknowledge, in so far as God, who would by all means bestow His salvation, only upon condition of persevering faith, limits His plan of salvation to such faith, and has appointed unto salvation all of whom He foreknew that they would thus believe, and whose salvation He has therefore foreseen, because it cannot and shall not deceive. For our Confession does not recognize a blind predestination, unenlightened by knowledge. Thus also the strict Lutheran Leonh. Hutter teaches, who in his Compendium employs chiefly the very words of the Symbolical Books, never in the least contradicting them: 'Christ is considered in the decree of election not only as a Mediator in general, but also in so far as He is really embraced by men in faith, etc. Do you then maintain that God has elected men with reference to foreseen faith? (Answer:) Why should I not believe it, since the Holy Scriptures most plainly maintain it? Thesis 1. God has resolved in His eternal decree that He will save nobody outside of those who in true faith acknowledge His Son Jesus Christ. Therefore: Thesis 2. God has elected men to salvation with respect to foreseen faith."

So far Pres. F. quotes the "strict Lutheran L. Hutter" and then proceeds: "Note among his (Hutter's) proof-passages, John 17, 20; 2 Thess. 2, 13; James 2, 5. The simple dogmatical definitions follow for him: The essence of God's election consists in the purpose, in the foreknowledge and in the foreordination.

The purpose is the will of God that whosoever believeth on the Son (namely, unto the end), shall have eternal life. The foreknowledge is the prescience (knowing beforehand), according to which He has foreseen from eternity the individuals who would thus believe in Christ. The foreordination, the predestination itself is the act according to which He has given to these eternal life—election took place both according to the purpose and according to foreknowledge. Cf. Eph. 1, 5-9, with 1 Pet. 1, 1, 2."

So far Pres. Fürbringer, this, we think, will suffice. He presents this as the distinctive feature of the Calvinistic doctrine of election, the Calvinists do not, as do the Lutherans, "make election to have taken place in foresight of persevering faith, i. e., do not condition election by this divine foreknowledge." Concerning the mystery he tells us: "Their (the Calvinists) hidden divine will is really the revealed will, for otherwise they could know nothing about its contents and import and about its relation to the revealed will" (Missouri says, it is not intended for us to know anything about it, that just this is the mystery. The Calvinistic cap fits both before and behind); "their revealed will is, in turn, a hidden will, it reveals nothing, in fact it only conceals God's true will, in so far as it contradicts the latter."

In "Lehre u. Wehre," 1868, there appeared an article by Rev. Dr. Sihler, in which he again sets it down as a Calvinistic error that God has elected without foresight of faith. In his Postille Dr. Sihler says: "These are the few, whom God of His free grace, according to the purpose of His will, has elected to eternal salvation and glory in foresight of their persevering faith in Christ, wrought by the Gospel," p. 170. In the sermon for the twentieth Sunday, p. Tr. "But these God has not merely foreseen according to His omniscience, as being in persevering faith, but at the same time has elected and foreordained them unto eternal salvation in Christ, of His free grace, and according to the purpose of His will."

Regarding the certainty he tells us in the same place: "To this grace we should cling and hold in faith immovably. . . . But we should not inquisitively seek and question concerning our own or others' election and predestination. For if we persevere in this faith until the end, we are certainly elected."

The sainted Director Lindemann, of the School Teachers' Seminary in Addison, dictated to his seminary students, among

other things, the following: "Election does not embrace all men, but only persevering believers. These were known to God before the foundation of the world according to their person, disposition, and number." "God gives the elect eternal life only because He sees them in Christ and as remaining in Christ, namely through faith."

"He has foreseen the elect, i. e. He has known before the foundation of the world what persons would believe in Christ unto the end (foreknowledge, prescience)." "He knew beforehand who would not believe, who would believe for a time, who would believe perseveringly. This knowing the persevering believers is God's foreknowledge." Thus Director Lindemann understood questions 321 and 322 of our Catechism! This he evidently regarded as the doctrine of the Missouri Synod. He uses in this connection two axioms, formerly published several times in "Lehre u. Wehre"; "Not for the sake of faith, but through faith, we are elected unto eternal life." (Not "unto faith," as Missouri now says.) "God has indeed elected those only who believe, but not because they believe." Faith itself is nothing meritorious, but only holds Christ's merit, in which we are elected. Therefore faith is indeed a necessary condition of election and yet not a meritorious cause. Still Dr. Luther very often says: On account of faith, for the sake of faith, because we believe. The Holy Scriptures also often say: By faith, so that our justification and salvation flow from faith, as from their fountain and cause. Then, however, Christ's merit is always meant, which faith has. But Missouri condemns all these expressions as Pelagian.

Past. O. Hanser (now first vice president of the entire synod) in November, 1867, presented to the New England Pastoral Conference (to which only Missouri pastors belonged), a catechization on question 321-328 of Dietrich's Catchism, and this catechization was printed in September, 1868, in the "Schulblatt," published by the Missouri Synod. The work has had the approbation of that whole conference as well as of the editorial management of the "Schulblatt"; and since the catechization appeared in this synodical publication and remained there unattacked and undisputed, the doctrine it contained is, in the fullest sense of the word, to be regarded as the doctrine of the whole synod. I direct attention to the following questions:

Under question eight a definition of election is given: "Elec-

tion is the divine decree, graciously to save all who perseveringly believe in Christ." (According to the present teaching of the St. Louis men it would have to read: "Election is a secret decree of God, to call some unbelieving persons through the Gospel, to enlighten them with the gifts of the Holy Spirit, to sanctify them in the true faith and preserve them therein and thus to save them. God has not elected believers, but unbelievers; that they become believers is the fruit and result of election.")

Question "27. To what condition on the part of man is, accordingly, election unto eternal life bound? To this condition that he perseveringly believe in Christ."

"28. How can we therefore describe the divine decree of election, since it is bound to this condition? We can describe it as a conditional decree."

"29. What does this divine decree of election embrace according to question 322 of our Catechism? It embraces in a certain order all causes and means of our salvation."

"30. In what words does St. Paul accurately state these? Rom. 8, 28-30, 'We know,' etc."

"31. We must here learn to understand, first of all, each separate word. What does the word 'foreknow' mean? To know beforehand."

"32. What does: 'Them He also did predestinate' mean? Them He elected."

"33. What did God foreknow in predestination? Persevering faith in Christ."

"34. What has God done furthermore, according to the apostle's words, for those whom He has elected as persevering believers? He has also called them."

"35. Whereby, by what means, has He called them? By the Gospel."

"36. What has He wrought in them by the Gospel, when He called them? Faith."

"37. What has God done further unto those whom he called? He has also justified them."

"38. How has He justified them? He has imputed unto them Christ's righteousness—has bestowed upon them forgiveness of sin."

"39. What has He finally done unto those who have been justified? He has also glorified them."

"40. It is important to know and to hold fast this order and plan of means and causes in election, because a large Protestant denomination—the Reformed-Calvinistic"—(now, alas! the Missouri Synod, the author of this catechization, the New England Pastoral Conference, the editors of the "Schulblatt," etc., etc., are to be included) "holds an entirely different doctrine of election. Who can state this doctrine in a few words? They teach that God unconditionally" (underscored in "Schulblatt" itself) "has from eternity appointed the smaller number of men unto salvation, the larger number unto damnation." (Missouri will not say the latter; she would thus keep up the appearance of being far removed from the Calvinists. Vain effort! But this subject does not belong here.)

"41. How many causes and means of election unto salvation does our Catechism state in question 323? Three."

"42. Which is the first cause of our salvation? The infinite mercy of God."

"43. What does St. Paul say, 2 Tim, 1, 9? God has . . . according to His purpose and grace . . ."

"44. Which is the second cause of our salvation . . .? The infinite merit of Christ."

"45. God's grace is given us in Christ Jesus, and we already have learned in Eph. 1, 4f. that God has elected us in whom? In Christ . . . through Jesus Christ."

"46. Christ has acquired this grace for us through His life, suffering and death. By what means is Christ, with His merit, offered to us? By the Gospel."

"47. What is therefore the third cause of salvation?" (—Of election, of predestination unto salvation? See questions 40 and 41.) "Persevering, saving faith in Christ."

These extracts are sufficient to convince every one who still loves the truth that formerly election in view of faith was taught in Missourian publications. So far as leading persons in the synod are concerned, the doctrine was publicly presented by Past. Schieferdecker, Dr. Sihler (who in his retraction expressly mentions, that he sent in his theses in agreemnt with Prof. Crämer; the venerable gentleman does not appear to relish bearing the blame by himself), Pres. Fürbringer, Dir. Lindemann and Vice. Pres. Hanser. So far as the synodical publications are concerned, the

doctrine was set forth in the "Lutheraner," "Lehre u. Wehre" and in "Schulblatt."

Now on which side is the "lie" and "gross falsehood"? On ours, when we maintain that the Missouri Synod formerly held the same doctrine that we still hold, or on Dr. W.'s, who calls this a gross falsehood? Still, Dr. W. tries to help himself. In Chicago Past. Rohe directed attention to Pres. Fürbringer's and Dr. Sihler's essays and said that he could not harmonize with these the present teaching of the opponents (the St. Louis men). Dr. W. answered: "One sees from this that at that time we still tolerated the second 'Lehrtropus' [type of doctrine] in our midst." Minutes, p. 88.

Again: "That was not properly the opinion of our Synod, but the private opinion of Dr. Sihler and Pres. Fürbinger. It was not mine, who am the editor, appointed as such by Synod, and besides a teacher of dogmatics. Whoever says that lies." Here again—"lies." Observe what a foul subterfuge is here resorted to by Dr. W.! Note well this strict, orthodox synod, opposed to all arbitrariness in doctrine and to all unionism, "tolerated," yes tolerated what she now calls "unfounded exegesis," "introduction at pleasure of foreign matter into God's Word," and "Pelagianism," and what she has now repeatedly characterized in the words of the C. F.: "All these erroneous doctrines are blasphemous and dreadful, whereby there is removed from Christians all the comfort which they have in the holy Gospel and the use of the holy Sacraments, and therefore should not be tolerated in the Church of God." And yet Missouri "tolerated" it, Missouri so true to the Confessions! In order, however, to palliate this anti-confessional toleration, the expression "second Lehrtropus" [second type or form of doctrine] has been invented, as if the discussions were concerned merely about a different manner of presentation, instead of about an entirely different doctrine! And in order to justify their present condemnation, which certainly cannot refer to an innocent manner of doctrinal presentation, they pretend that we have not the "2d Lehrtropus" at all, but an altogether different doctrine; they did not condemn the "2d Lehrtropus"—but then, again, this will not harmonize with what Dr. W. says in the same Minutes, p. 16: "These (the dogmaticians, who have the 2d Lehrtropus) do not speak of the election spoken of in the C. F.; they refer to an altogether different thing." So here

the "Tropus" is quite a different thing, a different doctrine. From the beginning they did not mean us, but "these," the orthodox teachers of our Church. Add to this that the 2d Lehrtropus will not at all "tolerate" the St. Louis doctrine. Pol. Leyser says: "Wherefore we reject and condemn from the bottom of our hearts the Calvinistic separation of some certain persons without considering their faith in Christ, as a horrible, blasphemous error." For "the Calvinists not only do violence to this clear passage (Acts 13, 48), but to the whole Scriptures, by inventing a bare appointment of some certain persons unto faith, when the Scriptures nowhere say that we are predestinated and appointed by God unto faith, but we are predestinated and appointed unto eternal life by the pure grace of God through faith in Christ." Even a Missourian will not dare to deny that Leyser hits exactly the present Missourian doctrine and rejects and condemns it as a horrible, blasphemous error. But all who have any acquaintance with our dogmaticians know that the "2d Lehrtropus" is throughout couched in the language Leyser employs. Even Pres. Fürbringer, as we have seen, calls this the point of difference between Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrine, that election is said to be a cause of faith, in so far as the latter would be the effect of the former. Thus the "2d Lehrtropus" does not deal at all gently with the lad Absalom, who, assuming the title, Tropus I, is trying to climb into the throne, but calls him a bastard. And this, Dr. W. tells us, he has thus far tolerated, that is to say, he has "tolerated" that "an altogether different thing" was proclaimed as God's eternal election, and the true doctrine of election was cried down as Calvinistic, and he permitted "Lehre u. Wehre," whose editor he is, "placed there as such by Synod," to do service for such a piece of deception! Only Dr. Walther's enemies will believe that. Moreover, the Synod from the start has never allowed its publications to be at the disposal of doctrinal departures, and Rev. Dr. W. would never have allowed himself to be appointed editor, if he had had to accept articles with whose doctrinal contents he did not agree. He would have regarded it as a piece of insolence, if any one in the Synod had demanded the acceptance of dissenting articles. This is so well known within the Synod that no more need be said about it. As far as my knowledge goes, Dr. W. has published two articles that did not receive his approval—in the one only the "form of ex-

pression used" was objected to, the "orthodox meaning of the passage, however, appearing from the context." In both instances Dr. W. immediately made his disapproval known in a footnote. The extended discussions on election (Pres. Fürbringer's alone occupies 80 pages), together with their condemnatory propositions, appear without a dissenting word. What right then has Dr. W. to say that this is not his own, not even really the voice of Synod, but only the "private opinion" of the persons communicating the articles? Who in the Missouri Synod so regarded the matter? Certainly nobody, till Dr. W. in the year 1880, in Chicago, said so. There may have been secret Calvinists in the Synod, who therefore did not agree with these articles, Dr. W. himself may have been one of these persons. The fact, however, that Dr. Walther accepted the articles without any remark, and that other pastors who possibly were Calvinistically disposed raised no protest, proves incontestably, that they did not regard their diverging views as synodical doctrine, and therefore kept these views carefully to themselves.

When Mr. Volkening published in St. Louis the "82 Trostreden" [Consolatory Discourses] of Lassenius, P. Grabau reviewed the little book in the "Informatorium" and at the same time sought to furnish a proof from the book against Dr. W.'s doctrine concerning the Church and the Ministerial Office. In reply Dr. W. said in the "Lutheraner," January 22, 1862: "It looks astonishing and amusing to us that the 'Informatorium' seeks to prove from this pure Lutheran book that we have taught false doctrine; astonishing and amusing, because we (Dr. W.) have selected and arranged these Trostreden." He evidently means: It is nonsense to suppose that Dr. W. would encourage the publication of something with which he did not himself agree. In the little book referred to Dr. W.'s name does not appear, and so P. Grabau did not know that Dr. W. had selected and arranged the "Trostreden," and that they could not possibly contain a doctrine that did not receive Dr. W.'s approval. So finely had Dr. W. caught his opponent that he was "amused" to see the latter squirm. At the same time he related how Dr. Luther (Dr. W.'s forerunner) at one time published a little book without adding his name to it, and how Duke George, Luther's bitter enemy, praised the book and declared: Luther, at any rate, could not write such a book. (Similar stories from the life of Dr. Luther

are now, of course, frequently told by Dr. W.) But stop and compare with this Dr. W.'s statement concerning the article which he had accepted in "Lehre u. Wehre," and by which Past. Rohe wanted to prove to him in Chicago how falsely he now taught! According to the way in which Dr. W. disposed of P. Grabau, he would have had to say: It is astonishing and amusing to us that Past. Rohe would prove to us by this pure Lutheran periodical ("L. & W."), how falsely we have taught! Wonderful and amusing, because we ourselves published this periodical! How different his evasion now! "Private opinion of Dr. Sihler and Pres. Fürbringer, but not mine, who am the editor." Over against Past. Grabau it was nonsense that he should encourage the publication of anything that was not his own teaching, over against Past. Rohe it is not nonsense; Dr. W. himself says that he did not agree with what he permitted to be published and dares to add: "Whoever says this" (that he agreed), "lies."

For Dr. W.'s greater discomfiture, the "2nd Lehrtropus" is maintained in the book referred to and this very explicitly and decidedly. On p. 153 we read: "This election did not occur absolutely, but in Christ Jesus, not without regard to faith, without which no one can please God, Heb. 11, 6, but by means of and through faith." P. 155: "We teach and believe, as God's Word teaches us, that election unto eternal life took place in eternity, not by a mere decree and pleasure, but in foresight of faith, since God knew that the believers and elect would remain therein." P. 157: "God has not elected us that we should believe, but because He foresaw that we would believe; but that faith is the means of election, to which in eternity He directed election, Paul shows in Eph. 1, 4: He has elected us in Christ Jesus, which means: God has elected us in Christ Jesus, whom we embrace in true faith, because faith is a correlative of Christ" (that is, faith and Christ belong together — Dr. W. himself translated the Latin word in the margin!) P. 185: "But because God foresaw that some would accept this grace, and that others would reject it, He decreed at the same time that He would elect the obedient and reject the others, the disobedient." P. 158 Lassenius says: "When faith is considered according to its relation in time, we may call it more a fruit of election, although we must use such forms of expression very cautiously; notwithstanding it is not contrary to the analogy of faith to say that the faith of the elect

proceeds from the election to salvation." By the warning that we should use such expressions cautiously, and by the mere concession that it is not contrary to the analogy of faith, Lassenius shows with sufficient clearness that these are unusual expressions, easily misunderstood, although they are not therefore to be condemned under any and all circumstances, providing one does not deny the proper relation between faith and election; and this Missouri does now. On p. 156 Lassenius maintains (just as Dietrich's Catechism and the Missourian "Schulblatt") that there are three causes of justification and election, and in this sentence Dr. W. has again translated a Latin word used by Lassenius. This sentence, too, passed properly under Dr. W.'s supervision. Not a single syllable indicates that he does not agree. In the preface to the book he says that the "whole contents are drawn from the pure and unadulterated Word of God" and afterwards he ridicules Pastor Grabau in the "Lutheraner," because he thought he had found something in the book that was contrary to Dr. W.'s doctrine.

I ask now: Did not Dr. W. most decidedly confess the doctrine of election as taught in that little book, especially since he explained two of the most striking passages by annotations? Did he not, with Lassenius, reject the Calvinistic proposition: "God has elected us that we should believe" (unto faith), and on the other hand accept the proposition: "but because He foresaw that we would believe," as well as all other statements of similar import? Dr. W. and his blind worshipers have here evidently only two statements between which to choose: Either he then already held the doctrine so distinctly expressed in the above sentences to be the grossest Pelagianism; and if so, then he acted as a genuine deceiver by encouraging the publication of such teachings and unrestrictedly praising the whole contents in the preface, and furthermore he shamefully played the hypocrite over against Grabau and ridiculed him without reason. Or, he at that time agreed with Lassenius; and if so, then he sins grievously against us, by calling it "gross falsehood" and "lies" when we say that he so agreed, that this was also his doctrine. Yea, he sins against us in either case by his accusations; for he evidently at least confessed the doctrine of Lassenius, whether he believed it or not; we must judge his position by his words. On which side, then, is the "gross falsehood" and "lie"?

In addition, Dr. W. in part republished a great number of other works written by the fathers and in part recommended them most unreservedly. These books teach an election in view of faith, defend it by citations from the Holy Scriptures, and what Missouri to-day teaches is most positively rejected and condemned. This is true, for example, of the renowned Weimar Bible, so strongly recommended in the "Lutheraner." In the preface to the new edition of this work Dr. W. says: "After using this work for many years, we say with a great multitude of the most enlightened theologians of our Church, most positively and confidently, that the reader has in this book an exposition of the Scriptures that is throughout in harmony with the analogy of faith and in doctrine as pure as gold." Now, this work explains "foreknow," Rom. 8, 29, and "foreknowledge," 1 Pet. 1, by: "foreknew that they would believe." This "exposition of the Scriptures as pure as gold" is now called in St. Louis an "unfounded exposition of the Scriptures." On 2 Thess, 2, 13: "Because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," the "exposition of the Scriptures as pure as gold" reads as follows: "That the Holy Ghost has called you to Christ's kingdom by the Word of the Gospel, and has wrought in your hearts true faith in Christ, and thereby regenerated, renewed, and sanctified you: and because this gracious work was known in you from eternity to God the Lord, Acts 15, 18, He from eternity also elected you in such sanctification of the Spirit and in such true faith in Christ." Because our call and faith were known to Him—that is now called gross Pelagianism. Could Dr. W. so have regarded it, when he overwhelmed the work with such unstinted praise? But whether he so regarded it or not — this much he can not dispute, that such a commendation is more than mere "toleration." In his "Beleuchtung," p. 31, Dr. W. replies on this point: When one, in recommending an otherwise excellent book, at the same time draws attention to the fact that indeed some things that are false are contained therein, the purchasers would thereby be filled with suspicion. But who ever expected to read anything of that sort from Dr. W.'s pen! Again he says: "In our Church we are continually taught that one should test all human books by God's Word and hold fast the good only. However much a true Lutheran may praise a book, it is always

a self-evident presupposition, that thereby he does not mean to say that the book contains no mistakes." "Does not mean to say" — even not then, when he does say it in so many words, as Dr. W. said it with regard to the "82 Trostreden" and the Weimar Bible? O these endless shameful evasions, which would all be unnecessary if he would simply and honestly declare: We did not formerly hold it to be false, we do now hold it to be so: our convictions have changed.

I must yet call attention to a book very warmly recommended by Dr. W. in which these make-shifts are annihilated. We refer to a book, which (as he says) "preachers can put into the hands of their hearers in order that these may thereby inform themselves respecting the difference between the true Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Reformed Church." Among the many works serving this purpose, the one by H. G. Masius ("Kurzer Bericht," etc.), in Dr. W.'s judgment, is the best of the older works. "This little book is much to be preferred to many other books of a similar nature, both on account of the earnest yet mild spirit displayed, a spirit that speaks the truth in love, and also on account of the clearness and thoroughness of its proofs." "L. u. W.," 1857, p. 43.

With regard to this little book Dr. W. can not say that he presupposed, when he unreservedly recommended it, that the reader would of himself recognize whatever falsehood it contained; for the book had this as its object, to show what is false, in order that the laity might learn to test other writings.

What, now, does the book say about the "difference between the true Evangelical Lutheran and the Reformed" doctrine of election? I quote only a few sentences from its thorough exposition of the subject:

"VII. Question: Did election take place in eternity according to the mere will and absolute decree of God, without the foresight of faith and of Christ's merit? The Lutherans say no. The Reformed say yes."

"That God elected certain men according to His mere purpose and will without the foresight of faith based on the merit of Jesus Christ, is the standard doctrine of all the Reformed who hold to their symbolical books and accept the proceedings of the Synod of Dort; and though some indeed grant that election did not occur altogether without the foresight of Christ's

merit and of faith, yet their idea is not, that God from eternity elected those concerning whom He foresaw that they would believe and would accept the merit of Christ, but that He elected a certain few according to His mere absolute will, in order that they might believe in time. Therefore faith is not regarded by them as a cause or condition of election, but as a necessary effect of election. Cf. here the Synod of Dort, pp. 342, 524" (and we, alas! would have to add, the Synod of Missouri on all pages). "Molinæus says in so many words: I recognize no election in view of faith, whether faith be regarded as a cause of election or as a preceding condition. God has not elected us because we believe but that we might believe."

That this describes exactly the modern Missourian doctrine, Missouri herself will not deny. But Dr. W. has most warmly recommended this book, which declares such doctrine to be false and Calvinistic. Could he have done that if at that time he regarded this as the correct Lutheran doctrine?

But how has he expressed himself concerning this doctrine? His blind devotees give themselves all conceivable trouble to prove that in the past already he had the same conviction which he has now. For him to be compelled to admit that he did not formerly, in this doctrine at least, hold the same position that he holds now, and that he either erred formerly or errs now, they seem to regard as the greatest possible misfortune, and seek to shun the thought. Certainly, from their point of view, it would be a misfortune; for it is a fact that Dr. W. is regarded by innumerable pastors and church-members as well-nigh infallible. How often have we had to hear in private conversation: You would be wiser than Dr. W., and he so learned and experienced, — he certainly is not wrong. This idolatrous trust is one of the powers that secretly supports the present false doctrine in that synod. That confidence would naturally be destroyed as soon as it would be conceded openly: Yes, Dr. W. also erred formerly; he taught as do his present opponents, and the controversy arose because he recognized and cast off his error, whilst his opponents still hold to the error. This would indeed be the open and honorable way for Dr. W. and his followers to take; but they do not possess either the love of truth or sufficient confidence in their pretended biblical truth, to take this straight, Christian course: they prefer to take refuge in evasions which,

on the one hand, are manifestly untrue, on the other hand, brand Dr. Walther as one of the greatest hypocrites that ever lived. Their subterfuge is this: "That, whilst years ago he held the doctrine which he now teaches and defends, he did not vigorously urge and explain it, only slightly touching upon it and thus preparing the way for its later introduction and explanation." This is sufficient for us. Prof. Dr. Walther, accordingly, formerly held the doctrine and also taught it, but with great caution and discretion. In his case no "new departure" occurred in recent times (he did not adopt a new doctrine). "2. We can herewith assure Prof. Loy that these 'slight references' to this doctrine operated powerfully among us. Our opinion is that when a professor, in his lectures on a compendium before his class, dictates notes whereby a doctrine, a Lehrtropus, etc., is corrected, such dictations arouse much more attention and have a greater effect, than when their contents is communicated otherwise. When they are of the nature of those stated to us by Prof. Dr. Walther, they constitute semina" (little seeds) "which, when they fall on good ground, at once proceed to germinate, grow and bear fruit" (yes, we see the fruits now!). "3. Prof. Dr. W., however, expressed himself at considerable length and quite plainly on this doctrine in the year 1863, in L. u. W., p. 289 sqq."

Thus writes Pastor Hügli, one of Dr. W.'s former scholars and present followers, in "L. u. W.," 1881, p. 323, and Dr. W. allowed it to pass! This, then, is the defence: Dr. W. held this doctrine already years ago, but did not urge it vigorously, only slightly touched upon it — N. B. "this doctrine dripping with comfort," the "most necessary comfort," etc., only "slightly touched upon it," and so prepared the way for its later introduction! Why, why, how Dr. W.'s lawyer forgets his role! That is just what we say: they now want to introduce a doctrine that was not introduced before; at that time, it seems, Dr. W. only prepared the way for this step. And how did he prepare the way? In this manner: whilst he permitted, in "L. u. W.," the free publication of this so-called false doctrine, he also recommended unreservedly other books containing the same doctrine, and always pretended to recommend nothing, and in particular to allow nothing to be printed, that was not pure in doctrine, — in the meantime, within the seminary walls, he taught his students a new doctrine? — no; only "corrected a doctrine, a Lehrtropus"

and thus only scattered little seeds, which germinated in "good soil," — naturally Pastor Hügli's heart belonged to that "good soil" — ours, if you please, did not — in this manner Dr. W. "prepared the way" for the "later introduction of the doctrine which he now teaches and defends." We ourselves cannot more thoroughly prove that Dr. W. has forsaken his former position; for here the matter naturally concerns only the position which he openly occupied, not that which he believed in his heart. No one can more deeply damage Dr. W.'s character than Pastor Hügli does; for, according to his representations, Dr. W. permitted a doctrine which he held to be false to thrive unimpeded in the periodicals edited by himself, and only gave occasional intimations in his lectures of the opposite pure doctrine! But all this they take into the bargain, in order that they may only hide the patent fact, that Dr. W. either erred formerly or errs now.

On p. 142 Pastor Hügli mentions the little seeds which Dr. W. scattered in the seminary and with which he is said to have corrected the 2nd Tropus. But in this he is decidedly unfortunate; for in none of the statements quoted does Dr. W. say that the 2nd Tropus really contains false doctrine, he does not once deny that faith is a cause of our justification and salvation, but he denies only that faith is a meritorious cause moving God. And this all orthodox dogmaticians of our Church have rejected, and we also reject it. Christ's merit is the cause; but no one possesses this merit except through faith, and only in so far is faith necessary. In so far our fathers at times call faith a cause, but they then add: not a meritorious, but only an instrumental cause. Dr. W. gives special prominence to this in the aforesaid connection, and this is what Pastor Hügli calls little seeds which now, in "good soil," bear such beautiful fruit! Thus Dr. W. is said to have corrected the 2nd Tropus! Pastor Hügli ought himself to have read our fathers, and he would have found that they all say the same thing; in fact, the statements quoted from Dr. W. are almost altogether utterances of the fathers themselves. What then, in the writings of the fathers, did Dr. W. correct? But now Dr. W. does not agree with the fathers, and his devotees create an atmosphere of mystification and cry out: See ye, Dr. W. did not agree already in the past!

Well, the writer was also a pupil of Dr. W.'s, and even after

the time of Pastor Hügli. He dictated to me among things the following (and my fellow-students — about 17 in number — may examine whether they have not the same in their notes. Pastor Hügli probably has it in his notes also, but he does not quote it—):

"Quenstædt: False doctrine I. of the Calvinists, who tear faith out of the decree of election and say that faith belongs to election not as preceding, but as following it, not to election itself, but to its execution. Those of Dort (say): Election is not in foresight of faith, but unto faith." (That is exactly the present doctrine of Missouri. Then Dr. W. dictated it to us as the Calvinistic antithesis! These are the little seeds, that were sown into our hearts! "Molinæus says: God has not elected us in view of faith, but unto faith." Here Dr. W. added by way of parenthesis: Cf. Luther's preface to Romans, where he says, originally faith and deliverance from sin flow from God's eternal predestination. See Carpzov's Isagogics, p. 1678." Was this perhaps one of those little seeds? We know now indeed that he understands these words of Luther in a Calvinistic sense.

As a second antithesis (false doctrine) he dictated to us:

"II. Certain Scholastics and papists, who maintain that the foreseen non-prevention of faith is an effect of election." According to modern Missouri's teaching, that too is quite right. Now, after all, the papists defended the doctrine that God justifies and saves by free grace alone! Bellarmin also belonged to that class.

Pastor Hügli appeals in particular to an article by Dr. W. in reply to an attack which a Reformed writer made on our Church. It is certainly interesting to hear how he expresses himself against a Calvinist on this question. The answer is peculiar, that I grant a priori. Not that he then already set forth his present doctrine, — precisely this is what he did not do. The Reformed writer had made exactly the same charges against the Lutheran Church that Dr. W. now makes against the 2nd Tropus, namely, that she was tainted with a Roman Catholic Pelagianism, or at least Semi-Pelagianism, whilst the Reformed Church ascribes everything to free grace, electing in eternity and before the foundation of the world, and calling in time."

From his present standpoint Dr. W. could have said only this in reply: "The objection does not strike our Formula of Concord. But this, alas! is true: From the time when the Form. Conc. was accepted, our theologians went astray in this

particular. For they have all taught an election in view of faith (and that was what the Reformed writer meant and what Dr. W. now means). The objection then really strikes our Church; for the fact that our Confessions are pure in this regard does not excuse the Church, but tends to her greater shame, because in spite of the pure confession, she has tolerated false doctrine." This much Dr. W. would have been compelled to grant his opponent, if he had then viewed the matter as he does now. But that he did not do, for he says in conclusion: "How, according to what has been said, a man of sound understanding could impute the slightest taint of Roman Catholic Pelagianism or Semi-Pelagianism to our Church is wholly inexplicable." He does not at all, in the course of the discussion, touch on the statement of our Church, that God has elected in view of faith, which proposition the Reformed have always decried as heresy. On the other hand, he grants that later theologians of our Church did thus set forth the subject: "As the unbelief of many, foreseen by God, is the cause for which God has from eternity resolved to reject and condemn them, so the persevering faith of a number of individuals, foreseen by Him, is the cause for which God has from eternity elected them to salvation." This would evidently be fundamentally false; for unbelief deserves damnation, faith, however, does not deserve salvation, but receives another's merit. If therefore some of our theologians have called faith a cause of election, they have nevertheless earnestly guarded themselves against this misunderstanding. They called faith an instrumental cause or a subordinate cause, never a meritorious cause. Dr. W. does not say who in "our Church" has taught this. He does not mean Gerhardt and Quenstædt, who very emphatically defend the "Tropus," for he cites them as his vouchers. And now this is why I call his reply peculiar. He does not say whether by the above sentence he means the "in view of faith" or not. Now they ascribe to the expression a false meaning, and Pastor Hügli points to the essay for Dr. W.'s present position. If Dr. W. at that time did not mean the "in view of faith," then Pastor Hügli proves nothing, but only creates the well-known atmosphere of mystification. If he did mean it, then he sought to conceal the truth from his opponent at that time, since our Church, and Gerhard in particular, has this "Tropus." Or do they now pretend that our Church had indeed the expression,

but did not connect with it this false meaning, and that we now do attach to it this false meaning? If so, then this last is an open, inexcusable slander, for which they, at the last day, will have to give an account.

There is no open testimony against the "2d Tropus" in this essay, and that is the point which here especially concerns me.

In general he says nothing about the "two Lehrtropen," but briefly presents the Lutheran doctrine of election according to the Form. Conc., puts the sentence, that election is a cause of our salvation, etc., into italics, and then says: "All orthodox theologians of our Church agree with this." As proof of the latter statement he quotes two passages from Gerhard, in which Gerhard also disclaims the mistaken idea that faith is the moving cause of election. In a note to the last of these quotations Dr. W. finally says the following: "There is accordingly a great difference whether we say: God has elected those concerning whom He foresaw that they would believe and would remain in faith; or: God has elected some because He foresaw that they would believe and that they would remain in faith, or on account of their faith. The former is entirely correct, according to Rom. 8, 29, the latter is Pelagian." There we have Dr. W.'s own utterance on the question in discussion, and it is exceedingly important, both on account of its contents, and also on account of the use he afterwards made of it in a critical position. We evidently have here the true "2d Tropus," only with the omission of the expression "in view," which Dr. W. later declared to be liable to misunderstanding, concerning which we are not now contending, for we only contend for the substance, which Dr. W. declared to be "entirely correct according to Rom. 8, 29." Our opponents have tried in the present controversy so to distort the above sentence as to make it mean: Because God has elected some to faith, He has naturally foreseen that they will believe! Such an evident distortion of their own words is really not worthy of being touched upon! Alas, we must continually battle against such perversions. When we have driven our opponents out of one corner, they at once, with the greatest innocence, sit down in another corner. We must, however, continue the apparently useless chase. Well then, God has elected those of whom He foresaw that they would believe, is made to mean: God has elected some to faith, has decreed: these shall in any case believe;

and He then foresaw that He would "execute" this unconditional decree! As though I were to say: The five wise virgins who had oil in their lamps, were admitted to the marriage—this means: out of ten foolish virgins the bridegroom resolved to admit five, to give them oil for their lamps and then to make them wise! The perversion of the sentence is all the more shameful because our fathers have used it as an equivalent in meaning for "in view of faith"; it has a fixed, well-known meaning, which the words also present with undeniable clearness. Whoever knows this meaning and still uses the sentence in another sense does not act uprightly!

But that Dr. W. did not so understand the sentence is clearly demonstrated by his appeal to Rom. 8, 29. "Whom He did foreknow," these words Dr. W. then understood to mean: "Of whom He foresaw, that they would believe and would remain in faith." This exegesis is irreconcilable with their present doctrine. Therefore they now term it "an unfounded explanation of the Scriptures." And the same Dr. W. has written since then ("L. & W.," 1880, p. 353): "It is indeed written: Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate, Rom. 8, 29; but where is it written: Whom He foresaw as believing unto the end, He also did predestinate; and what creature in heaven or on earth has a right to add aught to the words of the Holy Spirit?" For the benefit of curious Missourians I shall immediately answer these questions. Where is it written, etc.? Answer: in "Lehre und Wehre," 1863, p. 300, in a note below; likewise 1872, p. 132. Again: What creature in heaven and on earth has the right, etc.? Answer: Dr. Walther has at least taken to himself the right, and now takes the right to himself to teach an election unto faith, of which neither the Scriptures nor the Confessions say a single word!

Now this much is certainly clear, that Dr. W., until the year 1863, professed in every possible way the 2d Tropus and only warded off from it the idea that faith, in itself, is something meritorious; this, however, our fathers did just as decidedly, and we do the same. Then Dr. W. had nothing to "correct."

But he certainly made a "new departure" in the year 1868. Because he never understood that our Form. Conc. uses the word "election" in a wider sense than do the dogmaticians, namely, as the Confessions themselves so emphatically state, that the whole doctrine of the counsel, will, and purpose respecting

our redemption, call, justification, and salvation is summed together, all which they then set forth in eight successive decrees, whilst the dogmaticians indeed speak of the separate decrees in exactly the same way as does the Form. Conc. and therefore do not essentially differ in doctrine, but understand by the word "election" not all the decrees, but only the last decree—because Dr. W. did not recognize this difference in the use of the word, therefore he could not recognize the agreement between the Confessions and the dogmaticians. He took the word in the narrow sense of the dogmaticians and still wanted to compress into it all that the C. F. included in the wider idea. Election is a cause, etc., he understood to mean: because God has elected this one and that one, therefore this one and the other are called, converted, justified, etc. For this reason he simply laid down the proposition: God has elected some to the call and to faith. In this way he gets into this difficulty: The F. C. says, election creates and effects faith. The dogmaticians say: Election presupposes faith as already wrought. That is an irreconcilable contradiction, one or the other must be fundamentally false, unless the word "election" is differently used in the two sentences; but the latter Dr. W. denies. He could not, therefore, escape the conclusion that two altogether different doctrines existed in our Church. No doubt it was hard for him to concede that. He did not like to cut himself loose from the dogmaticians, and did not renounce them in his controversy with the Reformed opponent, but presented the matter as though only a few later teachers ascribed merit to faith. But the difficulty does not lie there. Dr. W. cannot bring Gerhard's, Leyser's, Hutter's and Hunnius' teaching into harmony with the Confessions. Possibly it was just his defense of the Lutheran Church against the attacks of the Reformed writer that first brought the difficulty clearly before his consciousness. In the year 1868 he simply rejected the "in view of faith." In the Minutes of the Northern District Synod, p. 24, we read: "It was objected, that in Eph. 1 it is said, we are elected through Christ and that thus faith is included, since Christ is apprehended through faith, and that thus the expression of the later theologians, God has elected in view of faith, is justified. To this the reply was made: There are no conditions in God, but we ascribe them to Him when we say, He has elected in view of faith."

That was surely a long step towards a "new departure," the real fundamental principle of the stoutest Calvinism: "In God there are no conditions," or, as Dr. W. says in the Minutes of '79: God does not ask whether we followed or not, but He acts as He pleases. "In God there are no conditions"—that covers the absolute reprobation of the Calvinist as well as the absolute election; that makes redemption as superfluous as faith, and faith in justification as superfluous as faith in election. That was a strong beginning, starting from a purely philosophical proposition. Dr. W. took his "new departure" not from the Scriptures, but from reason. We read further: "To the question, in how far it is Pelagianism if faith is regarded as a middle term, so that the motive in election is not faith itself, but Christ and His merit embraced through faith?" (to this question so accurately and correctly put) "the answer was given: This places a condition in God. Faith is indeed a middle link; but when one says, God has elected in view of faith, faith is not a middle link but a condition. One may distinguish ever so subtly, still a certain causality is ascribed to faith." There the matter rested.

"In view of faith" declares a condition, a certain causality on the part of faith, and that is Pelagian. Moreover, the thesis under which this was presented, teaches an election unto the call and unto faith. It reads: "Election is so related to this change of man (regeneration), that God by virtue of His eternal election, also in time, of pure grace, for Christ's sake, operates efficaciously and brings about that His elect—all whom He has predestinated unto eternal life—come to the means of grace and are converted." The idea of election "includes 1) God's love for the elect in eternity; 2) the choosing of the elect from among other men." That this conception is somewhat narrower than that set forth in the eight decrees of the F. C. can be seen with "half an eye." Starting from this idea, it was said, "that everything which God does in time to accomplish the salvation of the elect is only a result of His eternal election"—redemption then too? What is left of the universal gracious will? With reference to Luther's famous statement in the preface to Romans it was remarked: "that if it flows from predestination who shall believe, there must also flow thence who shall not believe; but by this we do not say that God does not want to save such persons." Luther's word "predestination" they naturally understand in the narrow sense of their

"election." Thence flows, "who shall and who shall not believe;" of course! If God has elected some unto faith, then it is finally decided that the others shall not believe. But one should not say that God does not want to save those "that are not to believe." That is Missouri's universal gracious will! At the following meeting, 1871, the thesis was once more put through the kneading process and it was emphatically repeated that election (N. B. in the Missourian sense), is a cause of all that occurs for the salvation of the elect, and then it was once more emphasized that "on the part of God no regard was had to man" and, of course, no regard to whether man "would believe and would remain in faith"—for this election takes care of that. Only one thing stood in the way: The fact that some believe for a time, then fall away and are lost. They are evidently not elected in the narrowest sense. Whence, then, have they faith, if faith flows from personal election? The Minutes answer: "As regards temporary faith, this is an effect of God's grace through the Word, but not of election. Election is only the cause of faith in the elect. Therefore an elect person either believes unto the end; or, if he has fallen from faith, he again returns thereto before his end."

There would thus be two sorts of faith. The one flows from the Word, not from election, and has not from the very outset the qualification that it shall abide; the people who have this faith are really deceived—that is Missouri's universal gracious will. That thereby the Word and Sacraments are virtually annihilated is plain; for the mere word can merely work "temporary faith," which helps nobody.

Thus Calvinism stood forth in fullest bloom. But a raw northwester accompanied by a heavy frost subdued it again for a time.

Outside of the feeble opposition that manifested itself in those two questions at the Synod of '68 (the questioner, we remark in passing, was Prof. Schmidt, who afterwards sounded the alarm), no open testimony was given in the Missouri Synod against the error that had crept in. Whether it would have been given afterwards, if things had not taken a new turn, I do not know. But in January, 1872, Prof. Fritschel, of Iowa, openly attacked the Missouri Synod for having, with special reference to our older dogmaticians, branded as Pelagianism the doctrine "that God elected and appointed unto eternal life those whose faith He foresaw." This,

he said, was a gross outrage upon our Church and our old teachers and was a disgrace for the Missouri Synod, because there were not at least a few who earnestly lifted their voices in protest.

Dr. W. replied to this in "L. & W.," 1872, p. 131 sqq.: "All this is, to say nothing worse, simply a gross perversion, an open falsehood," etc. "Not one earthly word" of it can be found. "Our Synod, according to Prof. Fritschel, has condemned as Pelagianism, with express reference to the older theologians, the doctrine that God has elected in view of faith. Such an assertion only an Iowa professor would be capable of making."

I shall not here investigate whether Dr. W. justly makes such attacks on Prof. F. I am only concerned about showing how he has expressed himself on "in view of faith." He decidedly denies that the Synod, with express reference to the older theologians, has condemned the doctrine, that God elected in view of faith, as Pelagianism, and then proceeds: "It is true, our Synod can and will not appropriate to herself the 'Lehrtropus' of our 17th and 18th century dogmaticians, but not for the reason that she thinks that our faithful teachers therewith desired to give expression to a false, Pelagian doctrine, but because this Tropus, however correctly it may have been understood by them, so soon as it is strictly taken, contains something false, namely the doctrine, that the elect are elected on account of faith, that man's faith is the ground, the cause, the condition of his election to salvation." Again: "Our Synod therefore confesses most emphatically, that the theologians of our Church also in the 17th century have presented the right doctrine of predestination and have maintained the same against the Calvinists. One thing only does she criticise in the form of presentation of this point on the part of those men; the expression, God has elected 'in view of faith' is an infelicitous term."

Here we find as clearly expressed as it is possible, what Dr. W. then censured in the 2d Tropus, namely, the expression only. And this can be explained; for the word "in view," if it be not more accurately defined, seems to denote merit or worthiness, and that faith cannot be. This only Dr. W. censured in the "2d Tropus," that the expression did not suit: the matter itself which our fathers sought to convey by this term be held to be altogether correct. Therefore he appeals to his former article against his Reformed antagonist, especially to the passage: that God has

elected those concerning whom He foresaw that they would believe and would remain in faith—is perfectly correct according to Rom. 8, 29, and he then adds: "What Prof. Fritschel says, our Synod attacked as Pelagianism, she has rather firmly held as correct according to Rom. 8, 29, and has confessed it over against the enemies of our Church." This is, again, a plain confession of the "2d Tropus," from Dr. W.'s own pen, and it must have the more weight, because he puts down Prof. F., who had charged him with a deviation from sound doctrine, as being, on that account, an open perverter of the truth. If Dr. W.'s words have any meaning, it is this: God saw all men, how in time they would be efficaciously called through the Gospel, so that they, without adding anything on their part, could and would be converted and saved through the power of the Holy Spirit alone, if a part of them did not wilfully and persistently resist the Holy Spirit. He saw in reality only a number converted and saved. These He elected, not because they merited it by their faith, but because they have forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ. This is the kernel of the doctrine, which our fathers "have presented and maintained against the Calvinists," as Dr. W. says.

How this harmonizes with what he said in 1868, Dr. W. does not indeed enter upon; and that, according to his understanding of the F. C., there must actually exist an irreconcilable contradiction between the Confessions and the dogmaticians, he says nothing about in his reply to Prof. F.—as little as he said anything about it over against his earlier Reformed opponent. Of election unto the call and unto faith not a word; of this, that in God there are no conditions, not a word.

In short, over against this attack, he silently abandoned the position taken in 1868 and confessed once more the doctrine of the dogmaticians. If that was mere policy, if he thought that the road for a "later introduction" was not yet smooth enough, and that he would have to continue still to scatter the "little seeds" with caution,—then all the worse for him; developments thus far hardly leave room for any other explanation, and "L. u. W." suggests this same explanation. In 1877 he began to move again in the matter. The Iowa men who had upset his plan on the former occasion, had in the meantime been declared by him unworthy of further reply; if they had again raised the cry, there would have ensued a haughty silence or their opposition would

have been advertised as proof for the truth of the teaching attacked. On the former occasion all was silence in the Missouri Synod. That might succeed again; and, on the whole, it has so far succeeded. Whether everything was really planned out in this way or not, this much is certain, Dr. W. has publicly professed the "2d Tropus." To report in brief:

1) He has allowed the 2d Tropus to be presented by influential men of the Synod in his paper, to be defended from the Scriptures and the Confessions, and permitted the contrary doctrine to be condemned.

2) He has unreservedly recommended almost countless writings of our fathers, which defend this doctrine and declare the opposite doctrine to be false; he himself has republished such writings.

3) He has in particular recommended Masius' short account of the difference between the pure Lutheran and the false Reformed doctrine as being an excellent work; but in this book the present teaching of Missouri is rejected as Calvinistic, and the doctrine which Missouri now rejects is declared to be biblical and Lutheran.

4) He dictated to us in the seminary the following as the Calvinistic anti-thesis: God has not elected in view of faith, but unto faith.

5) He himself, personally and publicly, twice professed most emphatically the doctrine of our dogmaticians; and he declared only the expression "in view of faith" to be unfortunate.

What a fearfully insolent front is required by the declaration that the Synod, and especially Dr. W., has always taught as at present! On which side is the "lie" and "gross falsehood?"

But this "gross falsehood," as well as many other falsehoods, is necessary on their side. False doctrine cannot be upheld by truthful words—that is certain a priori—and so the defenders of the falsehood must distort and falsify all things under discussion. History and language are disfigured, false conclusions drawn, the motive of the opponents is slandered, their own former words impudently denied, and all this with a show of great humility and holiness, as though all the honor is given to God, whilst in reality they are only too proud to make the simple confession: Yes, we have erred!

I now proceed to show briefly how the present public con-

troversy broke out. In regard to this point also Missouri endeavors—Dr. W. again in the van—to practice shameful deception. He repeatedly protested—in Chicago invoking God's name —that he was guiltless as touching this controversy. We so-called opponents were reproached, because we should have brought the matter before the synodical meetings and should not at once(?) have resorted to open publications. The matter of immediate concern, in this connection, is as to what Prof. Schmidt and the writer have done. In the fall of 1877 the Western District of the Synod of Missouri took up the thread which the Northern District had begun to spin in 1868 and '71, which Prof. Fritschel had broken off and Dr. W. had temporarily dropped. The Minutes of '77 taught openly and unequivocally an election unto the call and unto faith, and this aroused the first opposition—privately, not publicly. The opinion seems to prevail quite generally, that the opposition came originally from Prof. Schmidt, and that I from attachment to him personally, followed him. That would not change the matter itself; however, the prevalent opinion is not in accordance with the truth. Furthermore, it is said, Prof. Schmidt was so embittered because he was defeated in an election at the synodical meeting in May, 1878, that he attacked Missouri in revenge. I only mention this here briefly, in order to brand it once more as a shameless slander; that it is slander, we have long since proved and have publicly called on the authors of it either to refute our proof or to take back the charge. They have so far done neither. Now the true course of events is as follows: Soon after New Year, 1878, I read the '77 Minutes and found, to my horror, that the doctrine it presented was not the Lutheran doctrine of election. It is true, Dr. W. does not there say openly and honestly that all our fathers erred—on the contrary, he quotes from them profusely, as though he found himself in fullest harmony with them; his own remarks, however, and his explanation of the important Scripture passages show a decidedly Calvinistic coloring, so that this one Report brings to light Dr. W.'s whole course of equivocation in the doctrine of election. After having sought in vain for months to get a biblical-Lutheran meaning out of Dr. W.'s false propositions, I laid the matter before my District President, Pastor Strasen, about the end of March, and then learned for the first time that Prof. Schmidt also did not agree with the Report and

had indicated this to leading men of his (the Norwegian) Synod. (The synodical convention, which is reported to have furnished Prof. Schmidt the motive for his antagonism, was held the last of May!) I did not urge Pres. Strasen to give an immediate expression of his opinion, but only presented and gave reasons for my scruples, and asked him to examine the matter. When, some time after, I again spoke with him on the sbject, I found that he had reached the same conclusion as myself. In the course of the whole year nothing more was done in the affair, excepting that I again and again examined Dr. W.'s erroneous propositions in the light of Scripture and Confessions, diligently studied also our old Lutheran theologians, as far as I had access to their writings, and conversed almost weekly with Pres. Strasen regarding the matter. At Easter (before that synodical meeting) I spoke with Prof. Schmidt on this subject. From that time on until October, 1879, we three, Pres. Strasen, Prof Schmidt, and I, frequently discussed the matter from all points of view, and we were agreed in our opinion on the Minutes. At Christmas, 1878, Prof. Schmidt was again with us, on a visit, and was then determined to set forth the Lutheran doctrine of election in the "Lutheran Standard" (for which paper he had already written much on other subjects), but without any attack on Missouri; he desired only to present the doctrine, since his conscience would not let him keep total silence in the face of error. Pres. Strasen and I advised him against this course, and urged him to speak privately with the St. Louis men. After being urged to the same effect by men of his own Synod, he did this. In consequence a colloquium between Dr. W. and Prof. Sch. was arranged and was held in Columbus, July, 1879. Dr. W. broke off the discussion after a day and a half, with the excuse that he had no more time. However, a continuation of the colloquium was agreed upon for the following year, and both sides were to have several representatives. Dr. W. asked Prof. S. if he would refrain from writing until that time, and received the answer: That depends on what position Synod takes on this subject at its fall meeting. (The Synod in the spring of '78 was a general convention and did not discuss this matter.) One thesis of the year '77 remained to be discussed by the Western District and Prof. S. repeatedly expressed the hope to me that Dr. W. would yield in so far at the fall meeting of '79 as to give us satisfaction, and that the collo-

quium for the summer of 1880 would be superfluous. So remote from his mind was the thought at that time of an open and direct attack on Dr. W! And this was more than a year after the synodical convention which was represented as having given occasion to S. for making open warfare! But even if Dr. W. had not yielded, if he had only not dragged the controversy before the public and tried to cripple Schmidt's opposition, S. would have waited with his writing until all private negotiations had proved fruitless.

I, for my part, sent a letter in May, 1879, to the general president of Synod, Past. Schwan, in which I fully presented my objections to the '77 Minutes, and openly declared that I found in the Report "tendencies towards Calvinism." I begged him to advise me how I should act. In reply to my letter Pres. Schwan put the question whether it would not be best for him to send my letter to Dr. W. in order that the latter might "express himself more fully concerning the matter." To this I gave my consent, with the remark that perhaps it would be better to wait until the commencement of vacation, because Dr. W. would then probably have more time. In the meanwhile the meeting of our Northwestern District took place, where I communicated orally with Pres. Schwan and asked him, whether, in his opinion, I had written in an unbecoming manner — in which case I would ask him to return the letter in order that I might make any necessary amendments! He answered: "Not at all, my dear Allwardt." He said, that if the matter were not otherwise adjusted, I should have to communicate with Dr. W., and this I declared myself ready to do, if it were necessary. I had now attacked the Western Minutes and feared that I might be confronted by the objection, that we had had the same subject in the Northern Minutes of 1868 and 1871; and why had I not first attacked these? I therefore concluded to lay the matter before the pastoral conference, which was held on the day following the close of synod. Without mentioning the Western Minutes, I quoted a sentence from the Northern Minutes of '71 and declared that I held it to be erroneous, and begged conference to express itself. When I desired to support my objections briefly from the Formula of Concord, I was prevented by loud protests. Let it be remembered: we are upbraided for not having brought the matter first of all before conferences and synods. Here I laid it before

a conference, where no layman was present and I was not allowed to conclude my speech! Pres. Schwan had already left, this reproach therefore does not strike him. I then declared that if I were not permitted to speak further, I should have to desist; but that the matter must some time be dealt with, since I did not agree with the doctrine set forth. It was then resolved that I present in writing my objections to the sentence in question, and that within four weeks I should send this paper to a number of the pastors, who were to see to its further circulation, and in the fall the matter should be considered at the pastoral conference. One member offered to undertake the defence of the sentence attacked, at that conference. All this took place. The defender in question had secretly sent my criticisms to Dr. W. and had sought from him weapons for the conflict: which I mention for the reason that Dr. W. now also learned from this source, what was the matter under consideration. It is not within the scope of my plan to report fully concerning the proceedings of that conference; I would only mention, that I did not there stand alone; and beside those who with me openly accepted the truth, many expressed themselves privately to me as being grateful that I had attacked the subject, for they had long been disquieted on this account — now they have all, indeed, become quieted. — No agreement was reached at this time. My worthy opponent, who had offered to defend the Calvinistic proposition, frequently answered me with the words: "Rev. Dr. W. writes," etc. Another one proved the election to the call and unto faith from Gerhard's Loci! From Gerhard? How was that possible? All very easy and simple! Gerhard quotes Calvinistic statements and refutes them. Thus in § 174: "7. Argument" (of the Calvinists). "The call and justification are effects of election, Rom. 8, 29. 30; faith likewise, for it is dependent on the call; and consequently faith is not a cause of election." He quoted this statement word for word, as though it were Gerhard's proposition; and when I answered: that is a Calvinistic proposition which Gerhard refutes, he most emphatically disputed my reply. Fortunately, I had the volume in question at my lodgings; I went immediately to get it. When I returned, the artful secretary said: "It's no longer necessary, Allwardt, we have already gone on further." They did not want their stupidity exposed to shame. I thus saw at once, that at least

some of my reverend brethren were no longer able to distinguish Calvinistic from Lutheran statements. But there were very few of them as yet on this occasion. It was resolved to continue the discussion the following year. I too was satisfied with this arrangement.

In the same week, however, in which we held this conference in Oshkosh, the Western District met in St. Louis. This was toward the end of September, 1879. While Prof. S. and I, as well as others, who knew about it, hoped that Dr. W. would there, at least to some extent, satisfactorily explain himself, but in no case expected that in our absence he would touch upon our objections, this last was the very thing he did, and in a way which I would have thought absolutely impossible. Whilst he had broken off the colloquium in Columbus and had agreed with his opponent on a second meeting for the following year, and had desired of Prof. S. to make no public attack until that time, and whilst he had not yet answered a syllable to my letter, which had been handed to him by the general president, yet he criticised our arguments before that convention, distorted them most monstrously, made them appear ridiculous, and heaped upon us the most hateful names imaginable. We are proclaimed rationalists, synergists, Pelagians, followers not only of the papists in general, but also and in particular of the sly and crafty Bellarmin (a Jesuit)! But, before I pursue this further, I must show that we indeed — I, to be sure, less than Prof. S. — were meant, for our names were, of course, not mentioned, and this fact was afterwards appealed to. But we knew it nevertheless, and were just as certain of it as though our names had been mentioned; and the whole cowardly, deceitful business appears the more disgraceful, because our names were not mentioned in order that it might be denied that we had been meant! Now for the proof: In the Minutes (1879) mention is chiefly made of the absolute, infallible certainty of the elect concerning final perseverance in faith, and in this connection certain persons who deny this "certainty" are referred to, i. e. derided from start to finish. Such an absolute certainty I had denied in my letter, and Prof. S. in the July colloquium had first of all directed his attack upon this point. No one beside us had attacked Missouri respecting this matter, because Missouri had not come out in this way with its fanatical certainty till 1877. Missouri had

already been attacked by Iowa on account of the doctrine of absolute election, but not on account of this certainty. In this point Missouri had no declared "opponents" except ourselves. Could there then be any doubt as to Dr. W.'s having us in mind? Besides, on pp. 23, 24 and 53 it is clearly indicated that an attack on the Minutes of '77 is being repelled. This could mean no opposition excepting ours. On p. 72 we read: "Satan would gain entrance among us"; "among us," one does not speak in this way of opponents from without! Again, the arguments that we had employed are considered in the Minutes and, in part, derided. We had directed attention to the many warnings of Holy Scripture which would have no sense if the elect were already absolutely certain of perseverance. The Minutes refer to this times innumerable; e. g. p. 97: "It is said, if each Christian should, according to God's Word, work out his salvation with fear and trembling, he should work it out with the thought: You can, perhaps will, be lost, therefore strive earnestly, that you may not be damned; for everything depends on your working aright." (Observe here the outrageous distortion! Here already Dr. W. manufactured the shaft, which the entire host with deafening clamour now hurls against us. You are synergists and Pelagians!) We had said that one must distinguish between a Christian's certainty regarding his present state of grace and the certainty of future perseverance; the first is absolute and infallible, the latter conditional, a "joyful hope." One becomes absolutely certain, at the moment of death, that he will not apostatize. In regard to this we read p. 73: "Our opponents say: Only in the hour of death can you be certain of this salvation." (Of perseverance in salvation we say, of actual election; for we are already saved in hope, Rom. 8, 24, and are absolutely certain of that also; but it is uncertain who will finally be found so remaining, as Dr. Luther says. Dr. W. omits this our distinction, and accuses us of saying: Only in the hour of death can you be certain of this salvation! And then he adds this fine sophistry:) "If we are to wait for the Lord each hour, then ought we to be ready each hour for death. But if I may not now be certain of my salvation, but only afterwards (!!), then those, who so teach, postpone till a distant time the coming of the Lord." Can there be a more wicked, and at the same time a more stupid, perversion of an opponent's

arguments, than this specimen from the Minutes of '77? The Jesuits alone in their butchery of some of Luther's sentences, have perpetrated something similar. To prove that faith does not flow from election (when this word is employed in its narrowest sense), I pointed to the fact that the non-elect often possessed faith for a long time. As the circumstance, that unbelievers also receive the body and the blood of the Lord in the Holy Supper (v. 1 Cor. 11), incontrovertibly proves that the Lord's body and blood are not received in a spiritual manner only, through faith (as Calvin would have it), since unbelievers do not have faith, so the circumstance, that the non-elect believe temporarily proves conclusively that faith does not flow from election, since temporary believers are not elected. This argument is touched upon on pp. 65 and 84, where, at the same time, one can see how Dr. W. evades the force of the argument. Both of us had appealed to Chemnitz' Examen. On p. 54 we find the answer: "Even so Chemnitz, to whom some would appeal, regards the matter." Shall I furnish more proofs that Dr. W. intended us? And yet he wanted to appear innocent in Chicago and insultingly appealed to the fact that on "this (his) side the mention of names had studiously been avoided." Minutes, p. 106. Yes, truly, this, but only this, he had "studiously avoided," avoided it there too, as we find p. 111: "He (Dr. W.) would not mention that person by name, in order not to uncover his shame"! What forbearance! What "Christian love"! He had already hurled his lance so often at Prof. Schmidt that every member of the conference knew whom he meant; but he did not mention "that person" by name! That sort of forbearance we had experienced in the Minutes of '79! Since I repeatedly directed attention to the fact that they had first made a public attack on us (p. 109 f.), Dr. W. said: "How little appeared there (Minutes of '79), that could be taken personally! only a little morsel, as it were the extreme tip of the finger, concerning which the speaker knew that the brother (I) had said it." "Of course another person was more emphatically opposed in the Minutes, but most of the brethren, even in the Western District, did not know who was meant," p. 111. There we have a confession from Dr. W. himself that he meant us — myself only slightly, more decidedly another person. The subterfuge that "most of the brethren" did not know who were

meant, affords him no help; for it is a ridiculously empty makeshift. When Dr. W. during the whole session of a synod attacks such well-described opponents, then, indeed, many would remain in ignorance as to who was meant! Three months previous, after the conclusion of the Synodical Conference, the colloquium in Columbus took place, and members of at least three different synods were among the auditors. No attempt at secrecy had been made. Could such a thing have been kept secret — Dr. W. attacked by a member of the Synodical Conference — could such a thing have been kept secret! Furthermore, it is only too well known that, in private circles, he spoke quite freely about other persons; I learned in the summer that he had spoken at a children's festival in St. Louis concerning Schmidt's opposition, and now, at the time of the synodical convention, only a few brethren knew to whom he had alluded! Dr. W. would have it appear that he hurled all those thunderbolts into the air! If it were true, the malicious procedure would still be only shame for him!

And now a few specimens of the way in which Dr. W. at that meeting "slightly" took notice of me, but more emphatically paid his respects to that "other person." Some samples have already been exhibited: "Satan would gain entrance among us." P. 72. "God has revealed to us a religion which shows how we can reach heaven; and here they come and remove one of the most important doctrines, a doctrine full of comfort, from the Holy Scriptures. Woe unto him that does this." P. 52. "May the devil requite you." P. 32. "And we miserable men would not believe that? We would say: it might displease God, if I should hope to be saved, therefore I will rather believe that I am going to hell, then I shall be a better Christian." P. 69. "Then faith would be doubt, then it would not be said, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that doubteth and is baptized." P. 73. "Delay the Lord's coming until a distant time." P. 73. "Paul says, if we had not this hope, we should be the most miserable of all creatures, and now they come to us and tell us: No; this hope you dare not have, everything may turn out otherwise." P. 90. "According to our opponents we ought to believe that it is still an open question whether we will reach heaven or hell." 91. "We should cling to the confession of hope; but this is a fine confession . . . when the world

asks me: Will you with your religion reach heaven? and I answer: That I do not know." 95. "Whoever teaches me that I should doubt in this matter, immediately plunges me into despair; for he says: you must rest your hope on yourself." P. 96. "They are blind Pharisees who speak so." P. 111. "Perseverance is a fruit of the assistance which God furnishes the elect. . . . He whose honor is injured too much by that, may see to it how he will get to heaven." P. 118. "This is nothing but the voice of the serpent." P. 90. "It appears as though these were clear-headed men and humble spirits who speak in this way, but it only appears so." P. 75. "These people want to rap us over the knuckles for having such a doctrine of election; but they have no doctrine of election at all." P. 76. "The apostles were not such rationalists as they who think the certainty of election renders watchfulness unnecessary." P. 104. "What a bad sign it is that our opponents have not only the papists as supporters of their doctrine, but also such a sly and crafty fellow as is this Bellarmin." P. 101. (Perhaps the gentlemen do not know that the Jesuit Bellarmin was a Calvinist in the doctrine of election — of about the same stamp as themselves; he denied the foresight of faith, and denied that we know a cause why God elects some in preference to others. God indeed has a reason, but we do not know it. That is a familiar tune to-day. As regards certainty, he denied above all the certainty of the present state of grace, which we, as Dr. W. well enough knows, do not do; we, therefore, have nothing in common with the Jesuits, the St. Louis men hold that first point in common with them, and, in addition, the noble gift of meanly distorting an opponent's words.) P. 101 we read: "Whoever, therefore, would believe God's Word should come to us; he that would make the matter plausible to his reason, should resort to those who deny the certainty of election. But what will befall those who make God a liar!" Here already Dr. W. summons men to take sides!

That was the answer I received to my private letter and at the same time it was the continuation of the colloquium with Prof. Schmidt! How, now, is it possible for Dr. W. and his associates to accuse us of having disturbed the public peace, without having first sought in an orderly way to reach an agreement! We are the ones that sought to hold private negotiations

and Dr. W. broke them off and caused them to be postponed to so distant a time, so that he could in the meanwhile prepare and educate his own followers, and by means of the Minutes gain the entire Synod for his Calvinistic extravagance, and so abuse Prof. Schmidt's name that afterwards he could accomplish nothing against Dr. W. As regards the first point, Dr. W. said already in Columbus: They would manage to turn till, then all those in the Synod who sided with Prof. Schmidt; and they have turned them nearly all. Dr. W. is not troubled by a lack of means for convincing others! As regards the second point, the above extracts from the Minutes furnish enough testimony that he tried in every possible way to make our opposition malodorous. And before the Columbus disputation we learned here in Wisconsin that they were of the opinion in St. Louis that Schmidt had rendered himself an impossibility as a theological professor! Naturally, that was Dr. W.'s wish and object, which he pursued until Profs. Loy, Stellhorn and others openly gave testimony against Calvinism. From then on he turned against these, in order, if possible, to annihilate them also. But up to this time he had incessantly persecuted Prof. S. In Chicago he overwhelmed him with abuse and made the gravest direct accusations against him. Schmidt was present as an auditor; twice he asked for the floor, but it was not granted him.

Dr. W. was permitted to abuse and accuse, without furnishing any proof, without giving his opponent opportunity to reply. He employed the same cowardly and cunning method of warfare at the Synod of '79. He had broken off the colloquium, although it had been appointed nearly half a year before, so that he could arrange everything and have abundant time. But he would have had to furnish proofs there for his false doctrine before an opponent who understood how to distinguish true from specious proofs. The new doctrine was not yet naturalized and the disputation with Schmidt, if a thorough one, might prove disastrous to the new movement. Thus the important matter had to be delayed a whole year. Dr. W. had first of all to work up the Synod at the fall meeting, and in advance he wanted Schmidt to remain away. The proceedings of that convention obliged us to come out publicly against the error — not because we had to defend ourselves personally against Walther's attacks, O no—but because it would

have been unprincipled to allow the false doctrine to have the field for so long a time. God's Word wants error rebuked at once; in the case of error publicly proclaimed it does not prescribe preliminary private negotiations, because in the meantime the error could enjoy undisturbed and luxuriant growth. If we had immediately made an open attack on the Minutes of '77, nobody could rightly have charged us with sin on that account. Since we did not do this, but first admonished the deceivers privately, even permitting ourselves to be put off a year longer, and since Dr. W. so evidently misused this our weakness, in order that he might once more contend for his error, disfigure our doctrine, distort and deride our proofs, render our persons suspicious and accuse us of heresy—we would have been not only unprincipled men, but must have been fools, if we had still continued silent. Paul at once rebuked the great apostle Peter publicly "before them all" (Gal. 2, 12-14), when Peter had taught no false doctrine, but out of fear of men had abandoned a part of Christian freedom, and thus had only tacitly denied the pure doctrine! Dr. W. had openly promulgated a false doctrine, by which, according to our own firm conviction, and that of our whole Church, the Gospel in its deepest foundation had been attacked; he had postponed private negotiations and procured time for himself so that he might in advance publicly disgrace us. As soon as I had read the Minutes, it was my firm conviction that we must now answer publicly, and I was determined to do this, and announced the same on December 3 to Pres. Strasen—I did not as yet want to attack them unawares, but to give them time to yield. But—to think of such a thing in the case of Missouri! Grossly to pervert their former words, or simply to deny them shamelessly, of such degradation they are capable; but to confess honorably: we have erred—nobody need expect of Missouri. Moreover, Missouri was at that time so drunk with victory, that it scarcely feared an open attack—either that such an attack would be made, or if made that it would do them any harm. Had Pres. Strasen, who up to the time of the appearance of the Minutes had agreed with me, but had now suddenly "turned" and had most obediently and also suddenly announced this fact at headquarters—had he not likewise reported that the new Minutes did not overawe me? In the beginning of January I said to him again that I would write against the Minutes, and that I was already engaged in the

work. He now urgently begged me not to do this, but rather go to St. Louis and "deal with Walther," yea, he finally offered to go with me. If he had taken orderly steps for the adjustment of the difficulty, I would have consented. But after Dr. W.'s mean and cowardly procedure at the meeting of Synod, to present myself before him in—humble submission, was as far from my mind as a visit to eternal Rome. If there had been only personal disputes, the matter would have been different. But one of the highest rights in the Church was at stake, the right of every Christian to protest against false doctrine and to be heard at least, before judgment is pronounced. To Dr. W.'s great learning and eloquence I could oppose nothing except my plain testimony for the truth; standing against him I would be at disadvantage in a hundred different ways. That he was not satisfied with this preeminence, but had employed such violent measures, made me exceedingly indignant, and I was determined now to take the course which promised me the greatest success; namely, to reply publicly to the heresy that had been publicly promulgated and defended by craft and sophistry. When afterwards oral negotiations were undertaken, I was found in my place and refrained, during these negotiations as well as in my essays, from all insulting utterances; for I always entertained the hope that Dr. W. would yield. This has not occurred. How our opponents in Chicago and Fort Wayne, and since then, defended their cause, yes theirs—not God's—to state this at length would require too much time and space. God willing, this shall yet be done, in order that unprejudiced people may obtain, at least in time to come, a just opinion of the present controversy. Surely, even though it be slowly, the Church in time always gains clear insight into the controversies through which it has passed. The confusion was so great at the time of the first crypto-Calvinistic controversies that the most sincere people did not, to a large extent, know who was right. But long before the end of the century everything was as clear as the sun, and the men who had been derided as wranglers and disturbers of the peace, who had been deposed and persecuted, stood forth gloriously justified. We cannot and will not set ourselves up as their equals; but we have learned from them that one need not despair of the victory of truth.

Here we have desired to prove only that we do not bear the guilt of the public outbreak of this controversy, but that the guilty

ones are Dr. W. and his devoted followers; he has tried to smuggle in the new doctrine, and when he was privately admonished by us, he replied publicly; only then did we follow him into publicity. What the condition of his conscience was, when in Chicago he cast the blame upon us, urged us to repentance, pointed us to God's judgment, we cannot conceive. In this connection I must correct an expression of Prof. Schwan's (Minutes, p. 109). He says: "If Pastor Allwardt was so anxious for private negotiations, let him explain why he did not accept, but declined the opportunity offered to him and another person?" In this way these gentlemen always question the honesty of their opponents, and never take back their charges, but allow them to stand, if they find they cannot go on. I have already answered this satisfactorily: before the colloquium agreed upon between Dr. W. and Prof. S. Pres. Schwan had agreed with Pres. Furbringer that the latter should first deal with S. Pres. Schwan sent the letter referred to to me, because he did not know where S. was at the time; he remarked that if he wished, I too might go along and that I was hereby invited. Schmidt could not go, and so I would have had to go alone, which was evidently not the object of the invitation. At any rate, I could not have gone since I was commissioned by Synod to make a trip to Minnesota and had to go as soon as I received notice of the appointed time. For this same reason I could not go to synodical conference, to which I had been elected and which would have been much more agreeable than the journey to Minnesota. On this account I am put down as a hypocrite, and this by the Reverend General President of Synod.

The same conviction that was awakened in me by the Minutes of '79 was awakened in Prof. Schmidt also; only a public testimony was now in place. While I wanted to publish only a single pamphlet and send it to all the pastors, he had decided upon the publication of a periodical. The first number appeared, as is well known, in January, 1880, the fourth month after the disgraceful Synod of '79: from this all can judge for themselves what is to be thought of the statement, made with so much emphasis by the St. Louis men, that Schmidt, exasperated at the synodical convention held in May, 1878, began the controversy.

Prof. S. had sent his paper to pastors and teachers only; he did not want to introduce the controversy into the congregations. Dr. W. answered in the *"Lutheraner."* "That is a sharp move," said some one at the time, who seemed to know the Doctor pretty well; "he now wants to work up the congregations rapidly." Certainly! And how did he proceed! Not by stating and defending the points actually in dispute and the propositions attacked by us. He laid down entirely new theses, which for the most part were quite correct, whilst he touched on the matters in controversy so equivocally, that one could understand them either way. Now already Dr. W. came forward with the open untruth, that the controversy really turned on the question whether our salvation lies alone in God's hand, or also in our own! As long as he succeeds in this deception, so long, but only so long, will he have the success about which alone he seems to be concerned. That the deception will finally come to naught, we do not doubt for a moment. Our contest is wearying, but not hopeless. May God the Lord have mercy on His Church, restore the erring and expose the wilful persecutors of the truth. Amen.

H. A. Allwardt.

Date Due

JUN 5 1981

MAR 31 '83

MAY 1 0 1994

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01002 9330